TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND UNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT

PROCESS WRITING IN THE SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AT

MUĞLA UNIVERSITY

A THESIS PRESENTED BY

ÖZLEM GÜMÜŞ

TO THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

JULY 2002

ABSTRACT

Title: Teachers' Attitudes and Understandings About Process Writing
in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University

Author: Özlem Gümüş

Thesis Chairperson: Dr. Sarah J. Klinghammer
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Dr. Deniz Kurtoğlu Eken
Bilkent University, Faculty of Education

In the last 25 years, process writing has grown to dominate the traditional approaches in writing instruction. Many studies have looked at process writing in terms of implementation or the composing processes of students using process writing, but far fewer have looked at it in terms of teachers' perceptions of process writing particularly in an EFL context.

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' attitudes and understandings towards process writing in the School of Foreign Languages (SFL) at Muğla University (MU), an institution in which alternative approaches to writing instruction are currently being sought. By finding out the attitudes and understandings of teachers towards process writing, a possible future implementation of process writing in the school may start.

Data were first collected through questionnaires distributed to the 34 teachers in the SFL. The questions aimed at discovering their reported teaching practices of writing, their attitudes towards writing, and their attitudes towards and understandings of process writing. The questionnaire consisted of 46 questions looking at the teachers' reported teaching practices, their attitudes towards process writing and their attitudes towards and understandings of a process writing approach to writing

instruction. Secondly, in order to gather more in-depth information about the teachers' understandings and attitudes towards process writing and to double check the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted with six teachers and the administrator of the school. Questions investigating the teacher participants' understandings of the process model of writing, their teaching practices, and the writing situation at MU were asked.

Data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed by employing descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages. In order to support the results, the chi-square values of each question were also calculated using SPSS. Data collected through the interviews were analyzed by using categorization. The teachers' responses were categorized under headings determined by the research questions. The responses of the teachers were then interpreted by the researcher.

The data results revealed that the teachers in the SFL at MU had positive feelings towards process writing. They knew a fair amount about process writing and expressed a willingness to teach writing by using the process writing approach. The teachers also agreed that process writing would contribute to their writing lessons and improve their students' writing abilities. Despite teachers' positive attitudes towards process writing, their understandings of process writing were somewhat limited and some teachers had misconceptions/misunderstandings. In terms of current writing instruction practices, the teachers reported using some elements of process writing in their classes but these were primarily pre-writing activities.

As almost none of the teachers had experience with the process writing approach, all the six teachers interviewed and the administrator of the school pointed out the importance of training sessions for teachers to learn more about process writing.

MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 1, 2002

The examining committee appointed by the Institute of Economics and Social

Sciences for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Özlem Gümüş

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Teachers' Attitudes and Understandings About Process Writing in the

School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University.

Thesis Advisor: Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
                         Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Dr. Sarah J. Klinghammer
                         Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

                         Dr. Deniz Kurtoğlu Eken
                         Bilkent University, Faculty of Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

—————————————————
Dr. Sarah J. Klinghammer
(Chairperson)

—————————————————
Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
(Committee Member)

—————————————————
Dr. Deniz Kurtoğlu Eken
(Committee Member)

Approved for the
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

—————————————————————

Kürşat Aydoğan

Director

Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank and express my appreciation to my thesis advisor, Mrs. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı, for her contributions, invaluable guidance and patience throughout the preparation of my thesis.

Special thanks to Dr. Sarah J. Klinghammer, the director of MA-TEFL Program and Dr. Bill Snyder for their assistance and understanding throughout the year.

I would like to express my gratitude to the rector of Muğla University, Prof. Dr. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı, who gave me permission to attend the MA-TEFL Program.

I owe much to my administrator, Assistant Professor Şevki Kömür, who encouraged me to attend the MA-TEFL Program and gave me permission to conduct my study at Muğla University School of Foreign Languages.

I would like to thank my friends in Muğla who encouraged me while writing my thesis.

Many thanks to my colleagues at Muğla University School of Foreign Languages who participated in this study.

I wish to thank my friends in MA-TEFL with whom we had wonderful relationships and who were both encouraging and helpful.

My sincere thanks to Aliye Evin Kasapoğlu, Ayşegül Sallı, Emel Şentuna, and Semih İrfaner for their invaluable friendship during the year. Without them MA-TEFL Program would be unbearable and I will never forget them for the rest of my life.

Finally, I am grateful to my parents and my brother for their continuous encouragement, patience and enthusiasm throughout the year and for their love throughout my life.

To my dearest mother and father ;

Birsen & Orhan Gümüs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The concepts involved in the teaching of writing have changed radically over the past two or three decades along with innovations in the field of writing. In 1977, Emig described writing as a mode of learning and soon new discussions began about the composing process. As writing began to gain importance both in first and second language studies, L1 researchers like Emig (1977) and Perl (1979) and L2 researchers like Zamel (1983) and Raimes (1985) started to investigate the writing processes of students. Along with these methodological and theoretical developments, a new pedagogical approach to writing called process writing emerged as a reaction against the traditional product writing. This study investigates teachers' attitudes and understandings about process writing in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University.

Background of the Study

Up until the 1970s, product-writing was the dominant approach used in the teaching of writing. In this traditional concept, style is emphasized, and instruction tends to focus on error correction. In product writing the focus is on students' finished products. In a typical product-oriented classroom, the various features of an essay are described and then outlined by the teacher in general terms for the students. After this brief description and outlining the teacher assigns the students a writing topic. The students then write their papers out of class time, and submit them to the teacher. The teacher collects the papers, reads them, notes the errors of spelling, grammar, and punctuation and, generally writes a final comment before returning the papers to the students (Williams, 1998).

Another important feature of product writing is that the teacher plays the leading role during the classroom activities. The teacher does nearly all of the talking during class time, and thus, as Williams (1998) states, the product model is considered to be a teacher-centred pedagogy. Arguably, this pedagogy discourages independent thinking among students because instead of trying to put their ideas in their minds on paper, the students are focused more on writing what they think the teacher expects them to write. Due to the fact that the activities are based on the individual work of the students, the students may also fail to foster group interaction between each other (Williams, 1998).

In the early 1970s, the process model of writing emerged as a reaction to product writing. Logically, in process writing, writing as a process is more emphasized rather than product. In the process model of writing, the students improve their writing by going through certain stages like pre-writing, planing, editing, and revising with the teacher offering advice and suggestions. The teacher does not assign specific topics, give evaluative criteria for judging writing, demonstrate "good writing" with models or assign grammatical exercises because the teacher is the facilitator (Zamel, 1976). Collaboration between students in small groups is encouraged and the teacher helps the students by giving advice and suggestion through formative rather than summative evaluation. As a result, the teachers give their students more time and opportunity to select topics, brainstorm, write drafts, revise, and give feedback. Linguistic accuracy becomes an issue of secondary importance because of the fact that ideas and organization have begun to take priority (Raimes, 1991).

With the help of the process writing model, it has been argued that students learn to write by writing and they become better writers (Dyer, 1996). Zamel (1987) gives examples from recent research on writing pedagogy such as Diaz, who investigated the growth and change in students' writing in her own process-oriented class. Diaz explained that the process approach of writing helped the students to feel more confident about their own writing. They began to write more meaningfully and better (as cited in Zamel, 1987).

Some teachers and theorists, such as Horowitz (1986) and Rodrigues (1985), are less enthusiastic about process writing. Horowitz (1986) states that the process approach's emphasis on multiple drafts may leave students unprepared for essay examinations and that overuse of peer evaluation may leave students with an unrealistic view of their abilities. He also argues that trying to change bad writers into good ones with the help of a process approach may be of questionable efficacy, and that the inductive orientation of the process approach is suited only to some writers and some academic tasks.

Teachers may also have different attitudes towards the process writing approach. For instance if teachers are accustomed to teaching in a teacher-centred, examination-oriented teaching culture, they may view writing instruction as assigning a piece of writing and handing it back corrected and graded with little or no feedback. For such teachers, the very different demands of a process writing approach may seem unusual or even impractical. Other teachers, however, may be more aware of and open to changes and alternatives available in the English Language Teaching (ELT) world. The facilitative and interpretational view of education that is inherent in the process approach of writing may suit this second

type of teachers because it gives importance to the cooperative interaction between students and teachers in and out of class time (Pennington, 1995).

In addition to varying attitudes, teachers may also have very different understandings of what process writing is. Caudery (1995) conducted a research on what the process approach meant to practising teachers of second language writing skills. He states that according to the survey he conducted, teachers actually have strong differing ideas as to what process writing is. Despite the somewhat mixed understandings of the participants about the process writing approach, the survey showed that overall, the idea of adapting a process approach to the classes was gaining strength and that more teachers were deciding to adopt the elements of the approach.

Composition studies have entered an era in which there is a multiplicity of L2 writing theories and pedagogies. As process writing emerged in reaction to product writing, the literature has also entered what is being called the post-process era. Post-process writing is not a rejection of process writing, but rather, it calls for the now-traditional principles of process writing to be complemented by various additions both from product writing and other perspectives. Despite an awareness that no single approach to writing instruction is going to guarantee student and therefore program success, this study nevertheless focuses on process writing because it is seen as a possible starting point to introducing a more effective writing curriculum in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University. As Pennington (1995) states, the process approach offers teachers who have difficulties in their writing classes a transparent, natural teaching-learning environment, aimed at linking writing outcomes as activities for both in-class and out of class. Here, Pennington is praising

the benefits of process writing approach for teachers who have limited ideas about how to instruct their students in writing. A process approach can be helpful because teachers teach their students every step they have to take while composing.

Statement of the Problem

Muğla University was founded in 1992. The language of education at Muğla University is Turkish. The majority of students who enter Muğla University, for example those in the faculties of economics or social sciences, are not generally required to attend English classes in the School of Foreign Languages. For other students, such as those in the vocational schools, one year of English is compulsory. The majority of the students, therefore, make a choice whether to study English for a year or not. The English classes are mixed in the sense that there are students both from the departments in which English is obligatory and from those in which it is not. Therefore, the needs of the students vary greatly, and this affects their motivation to write. For some students writing is the primary skill needed whereas for others, writing is of secondary importance.

Since the founding of Muğla University's School of Foreign Languages, the product approach of writing has been used by its teachers. The teachers generally assign topics to the students, who write their essays and hand them back to the teacher one day later. The teacher evaluates the papers and gives them back to the students. The teachers give summative evaluations to the students writings, that is, only at the end of their writing. Primarily, the importance for teachers seems to be on grammar rather than on the content and organization of the essay. When the students get their papers back, they rarely look at them to see their mistakes and correct them, because the teachers do not ask for a revised form of the papers. Rather, it has been

observed that they generally put the papers aside and forget them. This is the predominant pattern for most teachers in terms of writing assignments at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages.

There are 36 teachers in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University and a common point of discussion among them is writing skill, which is frequently the most discussed topic during the weekly meetings and the yearly evaluation meeting. As based on the writings of the students and the results of the students' midterm achievement tests and final achievement test, the teachers all complain about students' not being able to write appropriately and effectively.

Based on the weekly meetings, the yearly evaluation meeting, and writing exams of the students, the EFL teachers at Muğla University have come to a decision that what the students need is not more grammar, but more extensive and directed practice with writing. There have been discussions among the teachers about how to achieve successful writing lessons, but all the suggestions have been restricted to ideas and no actual changes have been made.

Apparently, based on these findings from the teachers, it may be beneficial for the teachers to introduce a process writing model in an attempt to help the students gain specific benefits, such as better organization of content, writing thesis sentences and increasing the overall effectiveness of the students' writing. Although the process writing approach will not transform the students into expert writers, it will give the teachers and students a framework for concentrating more on a particular piece of writing and dealing with it more effectively.

Before attempting to introduce process writing on a wide scale at Muğla University, it is important to look at the attitudes of teachers towards the process

writing approach because it is the teachers who will be required to implement it. In addition to addressing this need, this study also reveals what the teachers do or do not know about process writing, how much they know if they have an idea of process writing, their ideas on the appropriateness of process writing for the context of Muğla University, and the problems that they feel they may experience in using it. In light of these findings, the change cycle in the institution may begin with the training of teachers about process writing.

<div align="center">Significance of the Problem</div>

The process model of writing has a growing importance in the universities in Turkey. Some schools, such as Bilkent University, Başkent University, Middle East Technical University and Anadolu University, are already using a process model of writing. Muğla University is a developing university and open to innovations. The administration is trying to catch up with the latest developments in the ELT world. This study provides a first essential step in the possible implementation of one of these innovations, a process model of writing, in the school. It is believed that the first step to beginning the change cycle is to start with the teachers who are at the heart of the teaching process.

Looking at the attitudes and understandings of teachers about process writing provides a first step in establishing a base-line for a future implementation of this model of writing in the curriculum. After using the results of this study to establish this base-line, the ways of integrating process writing in the curriculum can be determined and training sessions about using process writing can be planned. Furthermore, this study might be useful for establishing a base-line for process writing for other newly founded and developing Turkish universities, which may also

be seeking ways of improving writing instruction in their institutions. Once the teachers' attitudes are found out, understood and training sessions are developed, the next step may be to use it in class and investigate how it is working once applied. The attitudes of students towards process writing may be investigated after the process writing approach is implemented.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

The aim of the study was to find out the attitudes and understandings of teachers working in, the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University, towards process writing.

<div align="center">Research Questions</div>

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes and understandings of EFL teachers working at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages about process writing?

2. What are the reported writing instruction practices of teachers working at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages?

3. What are the attitudes of teachers working at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages towards writing?

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Writing is a messy process. It is not linear; it is recursive, a process in which the writer writes, then plans, or revises, and then writes again (Perl, 1979). Writing also requires knowledge and focuses on thought. In order to write, students must have something to say. By writing, students not only express knowledge but also discover knowledge (Risinger, 1987). Writing is an integrative process combining the total intellectual capacities of the writer (Risinger, 1987).

During the composing process, the teacher may play as important a role as the students. It is from the teacher that the very first step of the composing process starts. It is not surprising that the teacher has often been found to be the key factor in writing. For writing courses to be effective for students, it is crucial to understand what teachers know about writing, what they know about the approaches they are using, and how effective their instruction is.

Before a new program is implemented in an institution, it is therefore crucial to find out the teachers' attitudes towards the various components of the new program, as it is the teachers who are going to interpret, transform, and deliver those elements to the students. If the teachers gain a deeper awareness of the new program to be used in their own institutions, the results of the outcomes will more likely be positive for both themselves and the students.

This chapter reviews the literature on the use of the process approach in teaching writing in comparison with the traditional product approach and post-process writing approach. It also looks at the advantages and disadvantages of process approaches, the effects of process approaches on learning, the adaptability of

process approaches to EFL classes and teachers' attitudes towards the use of process approaches in teaching writing.

<div align="center">Definition of a Process Writing Approach</div>

White and Arndt (1991) state that they "see a process focused approach to writing as an enabling approach"(p. 5). The goal of this approach in other words, is to help students to see themselves as "writers", to increase awareness for both students and teachers, and to help students to put their ideas into more coherent and meaningful messages.

Reflecting the writing definitions at the start of this chapter, the process model suggests that a finished paper comes out of a complex interaction of activities that include several stages of development: pre-writing, planning, drafting, revising, editing, and evaluating. These stages help the writer to develop a successful writing (Williams, 1998).

<u>Pre-writing</u>

Pre-writing activities help students generate ideas, strategies, and information for a given writing task. These activities take place before students start writing the first draft of their papers. There are different ways of doing pre-writing activities such as brainstorming, outlining, discussions, and free writing (White and Arndt, 1991; Williams, 1998).

<u>Planning</u>

With the help of pre-writing activities, the students have more information about the writing topic they are going to address in their writing. Before putting these ideas on paper, students make some kind of plan about how to compose their writing

with the help of the pre-writing activities such as outlining, free writing (White and Arndt, 1991; Williams, 1998).

Drafting

After students have generated ideas and prepared a plan for their topics, they begin writing the first draft. While producing the first draft, the point that students should consider is that they should not spend much time correcting their grammatical mistakes. Rather, students should concentrate on getting their ideas down on paper (White and Arndt,1991; Williams,1998).

Revising

Revising is an important part of the writing process and may occur at every stage. In revising, students make necessary changes in their writing. Revising includes taking into consideration suggestions from a peer or a teacher about how to improve the writing (White and Arndt,1991; Williams,1998).

Editing

Editing is the last stage before evaluating. Editing occurs after revising. In editing, the main focus is on surface features of the paper, such as punctuation, spelling, and usage. Students get feedback from their teachers and peers about editing and give the last shape to their writing (Williams, 1998).

Evaluating

Evaluating is generally considered to be the last stage of process writing though in fact it may occur at every stage and may be carried out by peers and teachers. The aim of evaluative feedback is to help students improve their writing and make ideas clear, not to grade their writings (White and Arndt, 1991).

Analysis of Product-writing and Process Writing Approaches

The concepts involved in the teaching of writing have changed radically over the last 25 years with innovations in the field of writing. Up until the 1970s, the teaching of writing was based on product-writing. In this traditional concept, the emphasis is on style, and instruction tends to focus on error correction. In a product-writing approach, instruction usually consists of analyzing examples of good form, learning various rules, and practicing those rules. Product writing gets its name from the fact that the focus is on students' finished products. In a typical product-oriented classroom, teachers outline, and describe the various features of an essay in general terms and then the students are assigned a topic. They then write their papers outside of class, and submit them. The teacher collects the papers, reads them, notes primarily the errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation and may or may not write a final comment before returning the papers to the students (Applebee, 1986; Williams, 1998). The final comment the teacher gives to her/his students is the one and only feedback the students get from their teacher. As observed in the researcher's own classes and in those of colleagues, when students get the final comment from their teachers, they generally do not go over their errors and many seem to forget about what they have written. The teachers rarely ask their students to draw on the feedback given and rewrite what they have written.

Another important feature of product writing is that the teacher is at the center of classroom activities. Since the teacher does nearly all of the talking during class time, Williams (1998) and Reid (2001) state that the product model is considered to be a teacher-centered pedagogy. Arguably, this pedagogy discourages independent thinking among students because the students try to write what the

teacher expects them to write. The students may also fail to foster group interaction between each other because the activities are based on the individual work of the students (Williams, 1998).

In product-oriented writing, the process the students follow is outside of class time and is therefore considered "opaque" or a "black box" by Long (1980) (as cited in Pennington, 1995, p.709). He means by "black box" that the students, without getting adequate instruction and feedback from the teacher, try to write on their own. As a consequence, while writing they too often tend to focus on grammar. Long also claims that at the pedagogical level, grammar instruction and correction of errors are given more importance than the production process .

In the early 1970s, the process model of writing emerged as a reaction to product writing. Since the 1970s, writing as a process has been perceived by many as a successful teaching methodology for improving student writing. For instance, Witte and Cherry (1986) argued that " perhaps the most exciting development in the field of composition studies in the United States during the past two decades has been the rediscovery of process in writing" (as cited in Susser, 1994, p. 32). Liebman-Kleine (1986) stated that process is not a dogma, but a concept of writing which has helped people to see writing in a new way and let them ask questions about the composing process and make a distinction between product and process. Zamel (1982) described the process approach as a concentration on personal writing, student creativity, and fluency.

Logically the emphasis in process writing is on writing as a process rather than on product. In the process model of writing, the students improve their writing through rewriting, with the teacher, and possibly other students, offering advice and

suggestions. Unlike traditional approaches which emphasize analysis and correction of the product, writing as a process methodology emphasizes understanding and helps students develop the process of writing. The process model of writing carries students through a cycle of pre-writing, free writing, peer feedback, and revision (Applebee, 1986; Gage, 1986; Williams, 1998; Reid, 2001).

The traditional teacher/student relationship of " teacher tells, instructs, gives rules, and the student listens, absorbs, and complies" does not apply in a process writing approach because in a process writing approach the students learn writing by doing, practising, and by being coached by their teacher (Mol, 1991, p. 14). Only if teachers have an understanding of the various roles they play in helping students to become more proficient writers, however, can the gains of a process approach to writing be realized. The teacher, as facilitator, does not assign specific topics, give evaluative criteria for judging writing, demonstrate "good writing" with models or assign grammatical exercises (Zamel, 1976). Applebee (1986) states that process writing teachers use certain procedures, which are designed to help students think through and organise their ideas before writing and rethink and revise their initial drafts (p. 95). The students collaborate with each other in small groups and the teacher intervenes to guide students through the process by giving advice and suggestions through formative rather than summative evaluation. Therefore, teachers give their students more time and opportunity to select topics, brainstorm, write drafts, revise and give feedback to each other. Linguistic accuracy becomes an issue of secondary importance because ideas and organization have taken its place (Bizzel, 1986; Kameen, 1986; Raimes, 1991; Myers, 1997). For Raimes, the teaching of writing should stress the students' ideas and how they express those ideas rather than

stressing grammar. With the help of the process writing model, it has been argued that students learn to write by writing and in doing so they become better writers (Dyer, 1996). The best way to introduce students to the process of writing is to involve them in the process. By preparing students for composing, students learn the phases of the writing process. Students can be shown the different stages in the production of a piece of writing and be encouraged to discover what works best for them. In moving from a product model of writing to process model of writing, the students may gain independence from the teacher, foster learner autonomy for their writing and be given the opportunity to work cooperatively with each other while drafting, revising, giving and receiving feedback (Pennington, 1995). Moreover, if students learn that writing is a process through which they can explore their thoughts and ideas, then the product is likely to improve as well (Zamel, 1982). With the students' changing roles and gaining awareness of themselves as writers, the role of the teacher also changes. For instance, a teacher in one study wrote in her diary about her changing role from marker of writing and authoritative figure, to a facilitator or an observer whose role was to support the students in their learning (Pennington, 1995).

Raimes (1985) defines the writing process as a "recursive", or "cyclical" process in which writers move back and forth between discovering, analyzing and synthesizing ideas. While writing, she notes, writers discover new ideas and change their flow of ideas. Writing, she claims, helps to create new ideas. Raimes thinks that the kind of process students follow may be helpful and effective in the second language classrooms for unskilled writers who have difficulties in writing in an L2. Skilled writers use strategies which stress generating ideas, writing drafts, producing

feedback, and revising. Helping unskilled writers to acquire these strategies might help them to focus on what they think and what they write, and ultimately improve their writing ability.

<div align="center">Process Writing and Post-Process Writing</div>

As with all trends in academic theorizing or in pedagogy, the strict process writing approach has, in recent years, begun to evolve as well as with the new writing pedagogy called as post-process writing.

According to the process writing model, all students are capable of becoming successful writers as long as the teacher provides proper guidance and encouragement. Under such guidance, students will find a way to access their authentic "voices". However, because of the fact that process writing focuses on individual writers, critiques from social constructivists accuse process proponents of being too narrowly focused on the individual writer and of not paying adequate attention to the social community in which the writing occurs (Mondor, 2001; Olson, 1999). Thus, post-process writing, the latest pedagogical movement of composition studies, emerges and presents its critique of the process movement. Post-process means "in addition to" process (Mondor, 2001, p.3) and in this sense it can be understood as a further step of process writing, which gives the students the opportunity to analyze and synthsesize the written text in its own social context. As Kent (1999) states, the attention in post-process writing is on the various forces which affect the writer, including the social context of which the writer is a part.

Post-process does not mean, however, that the students no longer engage in techniques and activities such as peer conferences or revision, which have been long associated with process writing (Mondor, 2001). Post-process does not reject process

writing techniques. Matsuda (in press) states that the notion of post-process needs to be understood not as a rejection of process pedagogies but as a recognition of the multiplicity of L2 writing theories and pedagogies. As a part of this, post-process proponents such as Kent, suggest that a larger rhetorical and social context must be discussed in relation to student writing.

By post-process, students gain a more critical kind of literacy. Students not only read texts for their intended meaning but also to analyze the various rhetorical stages employed by a writer for a specific audience at a particular moment in time (Mondor, 2002). Post-process theorizing emphasizes writing as a public interpretative act, taking place in a situated context (You, 2002, p. 3).As Kent (1999) states:

> So when post-process theorists claim that writing is a public act,
> they mean that writing constitutes a specific communicative
> interaction occurring among individuals at specific historical
> moments and in specific relations with others and with the world
> and because these moments and relations change, no process can
> capture what writers do during these changing moments and
> within these changing relations (p. 1-2).

In other words, according to the post-process approach, writing is not created within an individual, or even between the students and the teachers, but is also influenced greatly by the social context in which the writing is taking place.

Ongoing research and developments in the field of writing serve as reminders that no approach can afford to remain unchanged, and all approaches can be improved – either by new discoveries, or by the incorporation of aspects from existing methods or approaches. In the case of process writing this is also true.

Recent Research On The Use of The Process Approach In Classroom Settings

As the process approach to teaching writing has in many places come to replace traditional product-oriented writing, many studies have been conducted in order to understand writing behaviour and writing pedagogy from the view point of the process approach. Recent research on the use of the process approach in classroom settings has tended to focus on students' composing processes when using the process approach. These kinds of studies showed that process writing has helped to establish a supportive classroom environment in which students consider themselves to be writers and in which students are encouraged to take risks and create meaning. Finally, these kind of studies help teachers to investigate the relationship between the composing process and teaching writing (Zamel, 1987).

Zamel (1987) gives examples from studies done on writing pedagogy such as Diaz (1985) and Hildebrand (1985) (as cited in Zamel, 1987). Diaz (1985), as the teacher researcher, investigated the growth and change in students' writing in her own process-oriented classroom. The classroom in which she conducted the study was characterized by several components of process writing such as free writing, daily journal entries, drafting, revising, editing, and writing groups that provided feedback. Diaz collected a variety of data from the students' writing. At the end of the study Diaz observed that over the course of a semester, the students in the process-oriented classroom began to write in a better organized and meaningful way and Diaz added that the process approach of writing helped the students to feel more confident about their own writing. Before the process model of writing was introduced, the writing activities were creating anxiety in the students.

Hildebrand (1985) observed ESL students' attitudes, perceptions and assumptions about writing. She conducted a study in two classes with an experimental and a control group. While she was focusing on product in her control group, she was emphasising writing meaningfully for real purposes and audiences, and also encouraging collaboration and peer feedback among the students in her experimental group. Similar to Diaz's findings, Hildebrand also reports that the process-oriented class gave students confidence and awareness about writing and about the writing process. She recommends using a process writing approach because she argues that this approach prepares students for academic writing and also fosters appreciation for writing among students. Jarvis (2002) also stressed the benefits of a process writing approach for improving students' confidence as writers and added that with enough time and practice, all students were capable of becoming excellent writers. He also added that the process writing approach valued the growth of individual writers.

Another study was carried out by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) looking at the effectiveness of process writing use by students. The study showed that the students in classes which used elements of process writing, namely, brainstorming, planning, revising, and editing , were more likely to produce comprehensible writings (Risinger, 1987). Evidence from the 1992 NAEP assessment in writing showed that by using process writing techniques the students achieved higher writing proficiency as measured by the NAEP assessment writing tasks (Goldstein and Arnold, 1996).

Tyson (1999) conducted a four year study in various Korean Universities about process writing. The reason he gave for conducting such a study is that in

Korea, the focus on teaching EFL composition at the university level tends to be almost entirely on grammatical correctness. It has been thought by the Korean language program administrators, language instructors, and students that other approaches to teaching writing, including the process approach, are inappropriate for their situation because the overall practice of language teaching employs a traditional product-oriented examination centred approach with an emphasis on grammar (Pennington, Brock, & Yue, 1996). Little attention in general is paid to writing in the classroom, and teachers still consider grammar and translation to be the most important components of language teaching (Ahn, 1995, as cited in Tyson).

Although the importance given to writing in the process approach was seen as being in conflict with their traditional way of teaching, the data collected through questionnaires and student reflective writings suggested that some of the techniques used in the experimental process writing classes helped the students to produce longer and better-developed compositions as well as to increase their confidence and motivation to write. Moreover, certain process writing-related techniques such as the teaching of pre-writing activities, writing in multiple drafts, teaching students how to peer-edit and self edit effectively, instructor comments on early drafts that focus more on content and organization than grammar, group activities that encourage interaction and the sharing of ideas among students, were all found useful by the students. The results showed that although the attitudes of students, teachers, and the administrators were negative about the process approach at the beginning, after they started applying it they realized that the students were in fact producing longer, more interesting, better-organized, and better-developed essays and that there was an increase in the students' confidence and motivation to write. For instance, one of the

students commented that when the professor used to return his paper after he had written his work, there would be no comment but only a grade. He would not read his essay again but he would just check his grade. But now, thanks to the feedback from his professor, he added that he could express himself and put his ideas in a better and more organized way. This student's self reports are relevant to the current study, since his explanations above about teacher feedback precisely reflect the same pattern of both EFL teachers and the students at Muğla University. At Muğla University, the teachers return the papers with little or no feedback on them and the students do not take the opportunity to look at and possibly learn from their mistakes.

<div align="center">Disadvantages of a Process Writing Approach</div>

Although the process approach now dominates many L1 writing programs, it has also been controversial. Some teachers and theorists such as Rodrigues (1985), Applebee (1986), and Horowitz (1986) are less enthusiastic about process writing. In part, opposition has been for practical reasons. Since, for example, process teaching often requires input both from the teachers and students alike, process writing is considered time consuming. Moreover, the total number of completed writings produced is fewer in number when compared to the traditional product-oriented writing, because in process writing the students deal with the same writing topic for longer periods. There is also an obvious conflict between the extended composing processes encouraged by the process approach and for example, the single-draft writing usually necessary in an examination (Horowitz, 1986). Horowitz (1986) states that the process approach's emphasis on multiple drafts may leave students unprepared for test essay examinations in which they have only one chance to respond to writing prompts and that overuse of peer evaluation may leave students

with an unrealistic view of their abilities. He also argues that it is questionable whether we can actually change "bad" writers into "good" ones with the help of the process model of writing and that the inductive orientation of the process approach is suited only to some writers and academic tasks because some non-native speaking students are not familiar with the inductive orientation of process approach or a quest for personal meaning. Many of the students have lived with deduction and removed writing in their past lives and they feel quite comfortable with their past experiences. He goes on to state that the process approach, in its almost exclusive concern with psycholinguistic, cognitive, and affective variables, in other words, variables stemming from the writer him/herself, has failed to take into account the many forces outside of an individual writer's control, which, nevertheless define, shape, and ultimately judge a piece of writing, such as instruction and peer feedback (p. 446). It is interesting that Horowitz foreshadowed nearly 15 years ago what the advocates of post-process writing were saying about process writing's giving too much importance to the individual writers and ignoring the social context in which the writing is created.

Even though Applebee (1986) is in favour of a process approach, he raises some questions on its appropriateness and practicality for all writing tasks. He mentions that process activities are not appropriate for all writing tasks because different tasks have different problems and in order to solve the problems, these tasks need different writing processes. While some tasks need more organization and planning, some need careful editing before being shared with a critical audience. He goes on to state that the process approach ignores these kind of differences and treats

all writing tasks as the same. Process approach instruction should make an explicit link between the process and the product.

Along with Horowitz and Applebee, Rodrigues (1985) criticizes the process writing approach, stating that what the process approach of writing does not realize is that students are not mature professional writers. Before students start writing, they need to learn structures. They need models to practise and only then might they start to think through their ideas, revise their ideas and write for real purposes and audiences. He goes on to state that what advocates of process writing misunderstand is that if they encouraged their students to write, the students would automatically improve their writing. We do not need the process approach to improve our students' writing he claims, rather, what the students need is encouragement and proper instruction about writing. The process model of writing can not create miracles in students writing. For these reasons, then, some academic ESL teachers have decided that teaching the process as it appears in most textbooks is not enough, and in some cases, it is almost inappropriate. The students' needs and the adaptation of a process writing approach according to their needs should be taken into consideration.

Process Writing Approaches and Second Language Teaching

In second language teaching, there has appeared no coherent, theory-based approach for teaching writing in a second language and so, slowly, the process approach to writing teaching has been widely adapted in the second language classroom (Caudery, 1995). The process movement entered L2 classes nearly a decade after the process approach was introduced as a new L1 writing pedagogy. Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) mention that ESL writing teachers have modified the instructions used in L1 classes to their L2 settings.

Studies have found that writers who are proficient writers in their native language use nearly the same strategies when writing in their L2. For example, investigations by Zamel (1976, 1982, 1983) pointed out that ESL writers with well developed L1 writing abilities were able to transfer L1 skills and strategies to their L2 composing processes. What the researchers and teachers have failed to understand is that by the time the students are ready to write and express their own thoughts and ideas in the second language, the students need the same kind of instruction that students in English classes need.

As the ESL approach to teaching composition has been based on grammar, the study of grammar and usage has traditionally been thought to be adequate for L2 writing instruction (Zamel, 1976). Zamel criticizes the concept that writing means grammar and states that "the primary emphasis on writing instruction should be upon the expressive and creative process of writing" (p.74).

Edge (1996) argues that teachers of English as a second language should become more conscious of the ways in which their individual characteristics and beliefs affect their students' learning. Based on this awareness, language teachers can consciously promote educational outcomes that are consistent with their own personal characteristics and beliefs, and at the same time encourage students to develop their own personal understanding to the content of instruction according to their characteristics and beliefs (Pennington, 1995).

One of the problems about the applicability of a process writing approach arises from the teachers themselves. Writing teachers who have not been trained in the practise of the process approach, often violate process writing principles and cause their students to misunderstand it (Susser, 1994). Therefore, in order to apply a

process approach in the classroom, teachers need to first be trained. If the teachers know and understand what a process approach is, they will obviously be better prepared to help their students understand it.

Hamp-Lyons (1986) mentioned that teachers who adopted the process approach over a product-centered one have often failed to see its superiority in terms of student involvement, interaction, and motivation because of their previous teaching practises in product-oriented writing. She nevertheless writes that the treatment of errors and the approaches to feedback in a process approach are appealing to teachers and learners alike because for many years the students have been discouraged by the red ink on their papers. The process approach has provided solutions to some of the most acute problems of the L2 writing classroom such as giving feedback, interaction between students and teachers, and how to express themselves (p. 789). L1 researchers such as Emig (1977), Perl (1979) and L2 researchers such as Zamel (1983) and Raimes (1985) describe the process approach as one which helps developing writers to understand their own strategies, how to use them effectively, and how to relate their experience to that of their peers. According to these researchers, the process approach enables teachers to understand their learners as the learners themselves do.

Caudery (1995) notes however, that "relatively little seems to have been done to develop a process approach which is specifically oriented towards L2 writing", and suggests that "the time for this may be ripe" (p.11). With this statement, he points to a general conflict about the applicability of research and pedagogical method in process approach from L1 being transferred to L2. L2 writing teachers are often more constrained than L1 writing teachers. The reasons for restrictions are

that there may, for example, be less time available for teaching writing both in terms of lessons per week and overall course length. Moreover, L2 teachers are divided between teaching a foreign language and teaching writing. These issues may have encouraged and even enforced a simplification of the process approach, or a pragmatic habit of using "bits and pieces" of the approach (Caudery, 1995).

<div align="center">Teacher Attitudes Towards a Process Writing Approach</div>

The implementation of a new program is a complex process of putting ideas into action. As implementation occurs at the user or teacher level, it is not surprising that the teacher has been found to be a key factor in the implementation process. For implementation to be successful and effective, a primary factor that needs to be taken into account before changes are made in any pedagogical program, is to explore what teachers think about it. Discovering whether they are in favour of a particular program is crucial because everyone involved with a program will not necessarily hold and share the same beliefs or assumptions (Mol, 1991).

Since teachers play a crucial role in the implementation of new programs, knowledge of their attitudes is important. Identifying teacher attitudes is important on two levels; the individual classroom level and the larger program level. On the classroom level, teacher attitudes affect teaching and the students. Research shows that teachers' attitudes influence both their expectations from their students and their behaviour toward them. If the teacher has a positive attitude toward what s/he is teaching, it may very well improve the output s/he gets from the students. Negative teacher attitudes may cause students to be distracted from the learning process. On the program level, teacher attitudes provide important feedback for judging overall program efficiency and effectiveness and for the improvement of a program.

Gauging the changing negative and positive attitudes of teachers over time helps to evaluate the effectiveness of experience, changes in training or procedures, or the general progress of program implementation. Learning about teacher attitudes can help improve program design and implementation, daily procedures, pre-service and in-service teacher training and support services (Measuring Teacher Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming, 1985).

Adams (1995) conducted a study on student teachers in order to investigate their attitudes toward process writing instruction. The student teachers stated that before the study, they were unclear about how process writing worked. After the project, they stated that with the help of the project they were able to understand how their future students might be feeling during writing instruction.

Clachar (2000) conducted a study about exploring both the oppositional and accommodative attitudes that Turkish teachers have towards writing pedagogies imported from the West, from where the process writing approach also emerged. The study was carried out with seven Turkish teachers. The data were collected through questionnaires, observations, and recordings of orientation/training workshops, ethnographic interviews and transcripts of teacher-student interactions. Out of seven teachers, four believed that the objective of the process approach, which moves students from a writer-based to a reader-based prose, was inappropriate for Turkish students who are taught to think and write in a different way. For the same reason, these four teachers opposed the idea of a process writing approach that gives importance to organization and development of ideas over spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Two teachers stated that they paid more attention to grammar, spelling, punctuation in their writing classes in order to help students to detach themselves

from Western ways of thinking and help them to preserve their cultural identity. This study shows that teacher attitudes are very important when deciding to implement a new program because it is the teachers who best know their students and, arguably, what is good for them.

Baines, Baines, Stanley and Kunkel (1999) also observed the attitudes of teachers to process writing. The researchers observed 300 secondary teachers of English in the act of teaching writing. They discovered that "the process approach to writing" showed change from classroom to classroom. The researchers found out that although the process approach they used varied from one to the other, teachers were more interested in "the process" rather than on improving their students' writing. The authors state that the product has become of secondary importance for most of the teachers (Baines, L, Baines, C, Stanley, & Kunkel, A, 1999).

Caudery's (1995) research on what the process approach meant to practising teachers of second language writing skills revealed that teachers actually have strongly differing ideas to what process writing is. The responses Caudery got from his survey about what "process approach" meant to the teachers, reflected a lack of consensus among the teachers as to the meaning of the "process approach". What a lack of consensus implies is that teachers may have different attitudes, understandings, and beliefs about the process approach and, therefore, frequently implement the process approach differently in the classroom. Different ways of implementing the process writing approach in the classroom may cause problems among teachers and students. Teachers, because of understanding process approach differently, may apply it differently from each other. Possible resulting

misapplications of the process approach may cause mismatches in the curriculum and in the writing processes of students.

Caudery asked his study participants to define what they understood by the process approach. Three participants stated that the process approach was different from approaches focusing on product. Two respondents offered the opinion that they believed in process as well as in product. Among the different understandings that emerged was that of one participant who defined it as below;

> I think of a process approach as a way to let students work on successive drafts of a piece of work before it receives its final evaluation. When I was in school, it seemed that most of what I wrote was immediately marked and that the schools operated as meritocracies, that is, separating people on the basis of ability or achievement. As a teacher I feel I have to help everyone and give them the opportunity to learn through their writing, not just be continually judged like horses at a finish line. (Caudery, 1995, p. 6).

The teacher above considers the process approach primarily as writing drafts. This may reveal an only partial understanding about process writing, as there is actually more to a process approach than just writing drafts. The teacher also compares a product model of writing with a process model of writing and adds that she has to help her students by showing them the steps to take while composing.

Although some of the participants mentioned that they were using a process approach, many were not using it appropriately, in other words, every teacher had his/her own concept of understanding of process approach and they differed from each other. For instance, some teachers understood "process approach" as only writing multiple drafts, while others spoke about "the process of writing" for example; pre-writing, drafting, and finally editing. One of the respondents said that the emphasis in instruction is less on producing the perfect product and more on

becoming aware of the various composing options- a view clearly in line with the "process-not product" concept. Four people mentioned explicitly that the aim of the approach is to produce good writing, or improve writing skills. These teachers seem not to realize the fact that process writing can not create miracles. As its proponents generally agree, process writing shows how to compose, analyze, and synthesize what students have learned. Some argue further that not only does it improve students' writing skills but also their thinking. One of Caudery's participants who was not using the process approach, gave the reason for not using it as finding it too impractical because of her/his class being too large and not being able to deal with the students' papers at every stage of writing. The respondent brings the discussion to the practicality of a process approach, which may be a concern shared by writing teachers in Turkey, who are also faced with large classes and tight schedules. The survey, nevertheless, showed that the idea of adapting a process approach to the classes was gaining strength as more teachers were being convinced to adapt and adopt the approach.

<div align="center">The Teacher Change Cycle</div>

Teachers move through a change cycle and become an internal part of it. By being part of the change cycle, they begin to understand the innovation that has been introduced, thereby they personalize it to bring it into their own practise (Pennington, 1995). Freeman (1992) states that "teaching is the integration of thought and action" (p.1) and that the key ingredient to teacher change is development and awareness (Freeman, 1989). In order to start a change or a new implementation program, the first thing to be taken into consideration is teacher development and awareness. Unless the teachers are made aware of the changes taking place in their institution or

given a training program, it is almost impossible for the new program to be successful.

<div align="center">Recent Research On The Teacher Change Cycle</div>

Pennington (1995) carried out a six month workshop/implementation on process writing in order to observe teachers' changing attitudes toward process writing. At the beginning of the workshop/implementation, Pennington observed that the teachers had doubts about the process approach. One of the teachers taking part in the implementation of the program expressed her doubts as follows. When Vivian (the teacher researcher) came across the process approach, she did not expect much from it. She had a negative attitude and even questioned its workability and applicability. Nevertheless, she decided to try the method. When she saw the outcomes of the implementation and how encouraging they were, she was convinced that the approach really worked. She reported that her own confidence and self awareness in teaching writing increased, as did the quality of her teaching. Pennington argues that the teacher's individual experience is important while using the process approach. Teachers should be able to integrate the theory and practise into their beliefs of teaching and the insights gained from the process approach and incorporate them all within each other. Therefore, teacher beliefs and attitudes are important. Before starting a new program, every teachers' opinion should be evaluated on an individual basis and teachers should be given chance to use a process writing approach even if they initially have negative attitudes towards it. Pennington, Brock, and Yue (1996) mentioned that based on this awareness of their beliefs and attitudes towards a new program, it will be easy for the language teachers to promote educational outcomes which are consistent with their own personal characteristics

and beliefs. While teachers are becoming aware of their beliefs, at the same time they encourage their students to become oriented to the content of instruction according to their characteristics and beliefs.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

Viewing writing as a process is both a theoretical and a methodological positioning for writing research, and a starting point for a particular context in which new approaches to writing are being sought. Moving from a teaching that focuses only on the writing product, to one that views writing as a process, requires a number of significant changes for a teacher who subscribes to the traditional model of writing, and the process of trying to implement a process writing program can be a difficult one. Because process writing is open to adaptation, it can be used by different teachers in a variety of ways, according to the particular context of the classrooms. In fact, as the post-process literature reminds us, no approach should simply be accepted as it is, or be considered the best approach for every context. Every approach can benefit from constant improvement.

The reasons for teachers' deciding to use or not to use all or parts of a process approach to writing as a pedagogical method in their classrooms logically depend upon whether they are convinced that it is advantageous both for their students and for the teaching of writing. As the implementation of a new pedagogical approach begins with the teachers, it is the most important part of this study to investigate what teachers know and understand about the process writing. After teachers' attitudes and knowledge have been explored, more effective measures can be taken to make teachers aware of new innovations in the teaching of writing and prepare them for

future implementation of some or all aspects of a process writing approach in the curriculum.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study is a survey which investigates the attitudes and understandings of teachers towards using a process writing model in the School of Foreign Languages, at Muğla University. In this department, writing is taught as a part of the integrated skills based course. The traditional approach of writing, product writing, is currently used at the School of Foreign Languages. Since the main purpose of this study is to explore the attitudes and understanding of teachers about process writing, it is also necessary to first ask whether teachers are at all familiar with process writing. Based on the findings, the implementation of a process writing approach might be planned. This chapter will present the study participants, the instruments, the procedure and the data analysis strategies.

Participants

The data for this survey were collected from questionnaires and interviews which were conducted with the help of the 34 EFL teachers at Muğla University. As the aim of the study was to explore the attitudes and understandings of teachers towards process writing, the only subjects were the teachers in the School of Foreign Languages. Thirty four out of 36 participants completed the questionnaire. Among the 34 teachers, six participants along with the school director were interviewed.

The background information about the participants in the questionnaire and the interviews is as follows:

Table 1

Background Information of Questionnaire Respondents

Age	Below 25	25-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	Above 45
Nos. of teachers	2	11	11	6	1	3

Total years teaching experience	Less than 1 year	1- 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Above 20
Nos. of teachers	1	10	11	8	-	4

Qualifications in teaching	BA / BS	MA	PhD	Diploma	programs
Nos. of Teachers	27	3	1	3	

Other schools where they have taught	Public / state School	Private College	University	Private Courses	Nowhere before
Nos. of Teachers	20	2	8	2	2

Teaching experience at Muğla University	Less than 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	10-15 years
Nos. of Teachers	3	17	13	1

Instruments

In this study, two data collection devices were employed: a questionnaire and interviews.

<u>Questionnaire</u>

Questionnaires are important instruments of research and tools for data collection. The function of a questionnaire is measurement (Oppenheim, 1992). As indicated by Oppenheim (1992), the reasons for using a questionnaire as a research instrument are that it requires little time, there is no extended writing, it is easy to process, it makes group comparisons easy and is useful for testing specific hypotheses.

The questionnaire was completed by 34 of the 36 teachers at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages. The teachers were asked to write their

names on the questionnaire but the results were used anonymously. The reason for writing their names on the questionnaire was that the interviewees were chosen according to their responses in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were distributed to the teachers on two consecutive days. The questions investigating their actual reported writing teaching practices and their general beliefs about writing were given on the first day and the questions exploring their attitudes and understandings about process writing in particular were distributed to the teachers the following day. By dividing the questionnaire into two, it was hoped that a more accurate picture of teaching practises could be obtained without possible influence from the questionnaire sections on process writing.

The reason for using a questionnaire was that the number of teachers was too large to allow sufficient time for interviews with all of the teachers and also for analysis of these interviews.

The questionnaire items were developed according to the research questions and the literature reviewed by the researcher on the various elements of process writing approach. While preparing the questions related to the teachers' actual reported writing instruction, the situation at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages was taken into consideration.

Reasons For the Type of Questions

The questionnaire (See Appendix A) was made up of three parts. In part A, background knowledge of the participants was sought. There were questions asking, for example, which schools they had taught at before working at Muğla University, their age, qualifications in teaching, total years teaching experience, and how long they have been working at Muğla University. Part B was itself made up of two

sections. Each section included a scale that was capable of eliciting data on a certain aspect of the behaviour being measured, and each scale included a number of questions. The first section of part B used Likert Scale type questions to investigate teachers' actual reported teaching practices. Before asking the teachers whether they were familiar with the process approach or not, their actual reported teaching practices were asked. The main reason for asking about their teaching practices was based on a concern that teachers might not be familiar with various terminology associated with process writing. By asking about their teaching practises, therefore, the researcher sought to uncover whether teachers were perhaps actually applying certain elements of a process approach, without being familiar with the term process writing. This in fact did turn out to be true in at least one case. The wording of the questions was intentionally designed to be clear and free of any process writing jargon. For this section, teachers were asked to choose items rated from 5 to1 (always, often, sometimes, rarely and never) in response to various statements about their teaching practices, for example, " I have students work in pairs or groups to prepare a single written text". It was important that teachers, while checking the items, took into consideration what they actually did when teaching writing. In this section, teachers answered 23 questions. In the second section of Part B, the questionnaire aimed to investigate the attitudes of teachers towards writing. In this section, eight Likert scale type questions were used. The respondents responded to a series of statements such as "I like teaching writing", by indicating whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed or strongly disagreed.

In part C of the questionnaire, which was given on the second day, there were questions on process writing which aimed at directly investigating teachers' attitudes

and understandings of process writing. This part was made up of two sections. The first section began with the question "have you ever heard the term process writing?". The participants who answered "no" did not go on to answer the rest of the questionnaire. For those respondents who said "yes" and did continue, they were then asked where they had heard the term. For this question they were given several options, as well as an open option, and were allowed to tick as many choices as were appropriate. In this section, there was also one open-ended question, which aimed at investigating their understanding of process writing by asking them to specify all the concepts, terms, ideas, and teaching techniques they associated with process writing. Question 3 in this section aimed at investigating how much they think they know about process writing by asking them to rate their own familiarity on a scale of "a lot" to "nothing". The second section of part C aimed at investigating teachers' attitudes towards process writing. There were Likert Scale type questions in this part. There were 11 questions in this section and the teachers rated the items from 5 to 1 (strongly agree, agree, don't know, disagree and strongly disagree). In this section, the items covered both the advantages and disadvantages of process writing as well as the teachers' opinions on whether they felt a process approach would be appropriate for their specific teaching context.

Interviews

The purpose of research interviews is to obtain information and to get respondents to express their ideas in their own words. Open-ended questions allow the respondents to say what they think in richness and spontaneity. The reasons for using interviews is that interviews when compared to questionnaires can help to prevent misunderstandings and most importantly, increase the validity and the

reliability of the questionnaires (Oppenheim,1992). Interviews also provide a double check for the study. Through interviews, the interviewer can obtain information that the subject would not reveal under any other circumstances. In general, interviews allow much greater depth than questionnaires. The interview questions were developed according to the research questions. As the purpose of the interview questions were to gather more in-depth information about the process writing approach, in particular questions about the teachers' attitudes and understandings towards process writing were developed. Interview questions were also based on the particular responses of the teachers from the questionnaire, in order to clarify the answers or remarks made on the questionnaire.

Six teachers and the administrator of the school were interviewed. Questions investigating the participants' understandings of the process model of writing, their teaching practices and the writing situation at Muğla University were asked in order to gather more in-depth information about their understandings of process writing and the context of Muğla University. The interviewees were selected purposefully according to the results of the questionnaire. According to their responses, two teachers (A1,A2) who reported knowing about process writing and having positive views about it, two teachers (B1, B2) who reported knowing about process writing but based on some of their responses, appeared to have some misconceptions or misunderstandings about process writing, and two teachers (C1, C2) who claimed not to know anything about process writing were selected. The administrator of the school (D) was interviewed in order to find out his views and understanding of process writing because he is going to be the person who will start the change cycle in the institution. The main purpose of the interviews was to get more detailed

information about the participants' thoughts and understandings of the process

writing approach. The background information of the participants who were

interviewed is as follow:

Table 2

Background Information of Interview Participants

Participant	Age	Total years in teaching	Qualifications in teaching	Schools they have taught	Teaching experience at Muğla University
A1	28	5 years	B.A	University	2 years
A2	30	6 years	B.A	University	6 years
B1	29	6 years	B.A	University	6 years
B2	35	11 years	B.A	Public/State School	3 years
C1	41	21 years	B.A	Public/State School	3 years
C2	30	9 years	B.A	University	6 years
D	37	15 years	B.A M.A Ph.D	University	10 years

The language for the interview was English because it is difficult to find the

Turkish equivalents of the terms used and all the teachers know English. It also made

comparisons between the teacher questionnaire data easier and helped increase the

validity of the interview data.

Procedures

The development of survey and interview questions is a complex one, and

often one of trial and error. The survey and interview questions have to be developed

and created and there may be problems with the design or items of the questionnaire

and interviews, which the researcher himself or herself may not notice. In order to

overcome these potential deficiencies in the questionnaire and the interview

questions and also to make sure that both the questionnaire and interviews work as

intended, the questionnaire and the interview have to be tried out. This process of

redesigning and trying out questions and procedures is usually called pilot work (Oppenheim,1992).

First, the questionnaire was piloted with the MA-TEFL students of Bilkent University and the EFL teachers at Hacettepe University. The questionnaire was given to the MA-TEFL students on March 27, 2002 and returned the same day. The questionnaire was distributed to 10 teachers at Hacettepe University on March 27, 2002 and returned on April 1, 2002. The interview questions were also piloted with a volunteer MA-TEFL student in order to check if they were clear and appropriate. According to the feedback of the EFL teachers at Hacettepe University and the MA-TEFL students, necessary changes in the questionnaire items were made by the researcher. The researcher delivered the questionnaire to 36 teachers at Muğla University on April 4 and 5, 2002. Before delivering the questionnaire, a meeting was arranged with the teachers in order to have full and informed participation of the teachers. Out of 36 teachers, 34 teachers completed the questionnaire. The teachers answered part A and part B on April 4, and part C on April 5. After getting the questionnaire back from the teachers, the researcher analyzed the results and chose six teachers among them. Appointments were made with the teachers and the administrator before they were interviewed. The researcher tape-recorded all the interviews and transcribed them afterwards. Due to the heavy workload of the participants, the interviews were carried out over a 3-day period from May 6 to 9.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

The data which were collected through the questionnaire required descriptive statistics. The Likert Scale type questions were analysed by using frequencies and percentages. Then, in order to support these, their chi-squares were calculated by

using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). Chi-squares showed the distribution of the answers by the participants in the questionnaire and showed whether these responses were significant or not. On the questionnaire part C, for questions 2, which asked the teachers where they had heard the term process writing, and 4, which asked the teachers to list specifically all the concepts / terms /ideas / teaching techniques they knew, categorization was used. For these questions, the researcher grouped the answers according to the major common points of the answers, for example, brainstorming, outlining, drafting.

In the analysis of interviews, categorisation was again used. The researcher looked for patterns that were common in the data. The responses given by the teachers and the administrator were grouped according to the content of the questions and research questions by the researcher. The interviews aimed at answering the following research questions:

Research Questions:

1. What are the attitudes and understandings of teachers who work in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University about process writing?

2. What are the teachers' actual reported writing instruction practices?

3. What are the teachers' attitudes towards writing?

The teachers responses were categorised under the following headings;

- Teachers' understandings of different elements of process writing

- Teachers' perceptions of process writing

    a. Advantages of process writing

    b. Difficulties / disadvantages of process writing

    c. Teacher -student interaction

- Teachers' teaching practices of writing.

- Training

- Contribution of process writing to the program

- Teachers' attitudes towards writing

The researcher interpreted the teachers' responses based on the data from both the questionnaire and the interviews.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes and understandings of teachers working at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages, towards process writing. Thirty four teachers including the administrator of the School of Foreign Languages participated in the study. Of the 34 teachers who completed and returned the questionnaires, six were then chosen to be interviewed, on the basis of their responses on the questionnaire. The administrator was also interviewed in order to learn in more depth his views and understanding of process writing, because he is the person who will make the decision on whether to implement a process writing approach in the institutional curriculum.

The questionnaire consisted of 46 questions and was made up of three parts. Part A aimed to investigate the background knowledge of the participants such as age, total years teaching experience, their qualifications, and teaching experience at Muğla University. Part B and Part C were made up of two sections each. Part B section I investigated the teachers' reported teaching practices of writing and section II investigated the teachers' attitudes towards writing in general. In Part C section I, there were four questions about process writing. In this part teachers were asked whether they had heard the term process writing, where they had heard it, and how much they knew about process writing. They were then asked to list/specify the terms, concepts, ideas they related to process writing. Section II investigated the teachers' attitudes towards process writing. The results for the questionnaires and interviews will be presented in the following discussion.

Data Analysis Procedure

The questionnaire consisted of 46 questions. Out of 46 questions, 44 were

analyzed using descriptive statistics. The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences

(SPSS) was used to measure frequencies and chi-squares of each question. Chi-

square tests were used to support the frequencies and percentages. The remaining

two questions were analyzed qualitatively using categorization. The distribution of

the questions on the questionnaire is given in the following table:

Table 3

Distribution of Questions on the Questionnaire

Question Types	Part A- Background Information	Part B I- Questions About Teaching Experience	Part BII- Attitudes of Teachers About Writing	Part CI- Attitudes of Teachers Towards Process Writing	Part CII- Attitudes of Teachers Towards Process Writing
Number of Questions	7	23	8	4	11

The interview transcript data were analysed by using categorization. The researcher

interpreted the results.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire Part B Section I

Research Question : What are the teachers' reported writing instruction practices?

In the questionnaire Part B section I, the questions aimed to investigate the

teachers' reported teaching practices of writing. There were 23 Likert type questions

in this section. For each question, frequencies and percentages and chi-squares were

analyzed and the results were interpreted. All 34 questionnaires were completed

fully, with no missing questions.

Table 4 presents Q1, which asks the teachers if they do all the writing activities in the book. According to the data, among 34 teachers, 22 (64.7%) of them often or always do all the writing activities in the book. The 12 teachers who only sometimes or rarely do all the activities make up 17.6% of the total. The results of the chi-square were significant for this question at a level of $p<.01$, showing that it can be considered quite common for the teachers to usually do all the writing activities in the book.

Table 4

Question Relating to Doing Writing Activities In the Book

Questions	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	χ^2
Q1	5	17	6	6	0	11.412**
	(14.7%)	(50.0%)	(17.6%)	(17.6%)		

Note. Q1- I do all the writing activities in the text book
χ^2 = Chi-square
** $p < .01$

Table 5 presents the results for Q2 and Q3, which are about bringing extra materials and/or authentic materials into the class. As shown in table 5, the number of teachers who bring into class extra materials and/or authentic materials from outside sources such as newspapers and magazines is quite negligible.

Table 5

Questions Relating to Bringing Materials In to Class

Questions	Always	Often	sometimes	Rarely	Never	χ^2
Q2	2	5	2	17	8	22.765**
	(5.9%)	(14.7%)	(5.9%)	(50.0%)	(23.5%)	
Q3	2	3	5	12	12	13.941**
	(5.9%)	(8.8%)	(14.7%)	(35.3%)	(35.3%)	

Note. Q2. For writing tasks, I bring into class extra materials (e.g., from the Internet, other books).
Q3. For writing tasks, I bring into class authentic materials (e.g., newspapers, magazines
χ^2 = Chi-square
** $p < .01$

According to the responses to questions 2 and 3, more than 70% of the teachers report that they rarely or never bring extra materials or authentic materials into class for writing tasks and only a small minority (9 for question 2 and 10 for question 3) reported even sometimes bringing extra materials or authentic materials for writing tasks into the class. The results of the chi-square analysis were significant for questions 2 and 3 at a level of $p < .01$.

Table 6 presents the results for Q 4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11, Q13, Q15, and Q16 which are about pre-writing classroom activities. The data show that in general, most of the teachers do all the activities covered in questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,11, 13,15, and 16 before having their students actually start to write. The numbers of teachers who do all these activities in these questions have slight variations, but in general suggest that the teachers try to use activities designed to motivate and prepare their students for the writing task before having the students begin to write. Curiously perhaps, even though the teachers do not simply let their students start writing without warm up or preparation activities, in the interviews, all the teachers mentioned students' unwillingness and lack of motivation.

The questionnaire data show that the teachers first tend to present a writing model, give suggestions and advice to the students about how to organize their ideas, prepare activities to help in generating ideas and provide input about the topic, and have the students work in groups or in pairs in order to get ideas from each other and brainstorm about the topic. The results of a chi-square analysis were significant for questions 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 at a level of $p < .01$ which means that there are significant differences among the answers teachers gave to these questions, in this case

indicating that the teachers always or often do these activities. The results of the chi-square analysis were significant for question 6 at a level of $p < .05$.

Table 6

Questions Relating to Pre-writing Activities

Questions	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	χ^2
Q4	10 (29.4%)	14 (41.2%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	19.235**
Q5	20 (58.8%)	6 (17.6%)	6 (17.6%)	0	2 (5.9%)	22.000**
Q6	12 (35.3%)	12 (35.3%)	8 (23.5%)	0	2 (5.9%)	7.882*
Q7	7 (20.6%)	11 (32.4%)	5 (14.7%)	7 (20.6%)	4 (11.8%)	4.235
Q8	3 (8.8%)	13 (38.2%)	12 (35.3%)	5 (14.7%)	1 (2.9%)	17.176**
Q9	6 (17.6%)	15 (44.1%)	5 (14.7%)	7 (20.6%)	1 (2.9%)	15.412**
Q10	3 (8.8%)	8 (23.5%)	12 (35.3%)	9 (26.5%)	2 (5.9%)	10.412*
Q11	11 (32.4%)	14 (41.2%)	5 (14.7%)	3 (8.8%)	1 (2.9%)	17.765**
Q13	7 (20.6%)	4 (11.8%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	6 (17.6%)	2.176
Q15	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	8 (23.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)	6.294
Q16	10 (29.4%)	9 (26.5%)	9 (26.5%)	5 (14.7%)	1 (2.9%)	8.353

Note. Q4- I present a writing model to the classroom before students start to write.
   Q5- I help students by giving suggestions and advice about how to organize their ideas.
   Q6- I provide input to generate ideas about the topic (e.g. write about your most memorable summer holiday) and type of the writing (e.g., narrative) before the students start to write.
   Q7- I have students work in groups of two or more for pre-writing tasks (e.g., brainstorming, outlining).
   Q8- I have students work in pairs or groups to prepare a single written text.
   Q9- I have students get ideas from each other before starting to write.
   Q10- Before students start writing, I have my students spend time researching about the writing topic.
   Q11- Before they start writing, I have my students spend time thinking about the writing topic.
   Q13- Before doing any actual writing, I have my students develop an outline.
   Q15- I encourage my students to brainstorm about the writing topic before doing any actual writing.
   Q16- Before doing any actual writing, I have my students plan what they are going to write
   χ^2 = Chi-square
   * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

In question 6, which is about teachers providing input to generate ideas about the topic and type of writing before the students start to write, there were two teachers who reported never providing input to generate ideas about the topic, whereas the number of teachers who sometimes, often, and always provide input to generate ideas about the topic is 94.1%. Similar, though non-significant results were found for questions 7, 13,15, and 16. For question 13, in which more than half of the teachers report at least sometimes doing outlining activities, the responses are in contrast with the interview data, in which the teachers stated that they did not often do outlining.

Table 7 presents the responses to questions 12 and17, which ask the teachers whether they have students concentrate on content or on grammatical structures, spelling, and punctuation when they write and whether, when giving feedback on students' writings, they try to correct all their grammatical errors or not.

Table 7

Questions Relating to Grammar In Writing

Questions	Always	Often	sometimes	Rarely	never	χ^2
Q12	5 (14.7%)	15 (44.1%)	9 (26.5%)	4 (11.8%)	1 (2.9%)	17.176**
Q17	9 (26.5%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	6 (17.6%)	2 (5.9%)	5.118

Note. Q12- I encourage students to concentrate on content rather than on grammatical structures, spelling and punctuation when they write.
Q17- When I give feedback on students' writing, I try to correct all their grammatical errors.
χ^2 = Chi-square
** $\underline{p} < .01$

Twenty nine teachers (85.3%), stated that they at least sometimes encourage students to concentrate on content rather than on grammatical structures, spelling or punctuation when they write, suggesting that overall, what the students write and how they express themselves is more important to the teachers than grammar,

spelling and punctuation. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 12 at a level of $p< .01$. Although it seems that teachers encourage their students to concentrate on content rather than on grammatical structures spelling and punctuation when they write, their responses to this question seem to be in conflict with those on question 17, which is about correcting all the students' grammatical errors when giving feedback on students' writing. It can be assumed perhaps that what the teachers try to do, and what they actually do, is in contrast with each other.

Table 8 presents the results for Q14, which is about writing drafts. The majority of teachers (64.7%) report that they rarely or never have their students write more than one draft of their work. The results of the chi-square analysis were significant for question 14 at a level of $p< .05$. Nearly two-thirds of the teachers (64.7%) have their students generally write only one draft of their work, and this draft becomes the final product of their work.

Table 8

Question Relating to Drafting

Questions	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	χ^2
Q14	4	2	6	13	9	11.000*
	(11.8%)	(5.9%)	(17.6%)	(38.2%)	(26.5%)	

Note. Q14- I have my students write more than one draft of their work.
χ^2 = Chi-square
* $p < .05$

When the teachers were asked in the interviews whether they had their students write drafts or not, the responses the teachers gave were exactly the same as the responses on the questionnaire. The reason for this tendency seems to be that the teachers feel they do not have enough time to have their students write more than one draft because of the tightly scheduled curriculum.

Table 9 presents the results for Q18 and Q19, which are about teacher feedback or peer feedback. The results of the chi-square analysis were significant for question 18 at a level of p< .01. Question 18 shows that peer feedback appears to be rarely used, instead, commenting on students' writing is apparently done by the teachers only. This seems to be true for editing also. In question 18, the largest group of respondents (73.5%) report that they either rarely or never have their students make written comments on each other's papers, while only about a quarter of them report that at least sometimes they have their students make written comments on each other's papers. Non-significant results were found for question 19, showing a fairly even distribution of responses to the questions of whether they have their students correct each others' punctuation, spelling, and grammar.

Table 9

Questions Relating to Teacher / Student Feedback

Questions	Always	Often	sometimes	rarely	never	χ^2
Q18	2 (5.9%)	3 (8.8%)	4 (11.8%)	8 (23.5%)	17 (50.0%)	22.176**
Q19	2 (5.9%)	4 (11.8%)	10 (29.4%)	8 (23.5%)	10 (29.4%)	7.765

Note. Q18- I have my students make written comments on each other's drafts.
    Q19- I have my students correct each other's punctuation, spelling, and grammar mistakes
    χ^2 = Chi-square
    ** p < .01

Table 10 presents the results for Q20, Q21, Q22, and Q23, which are about the assessment of papers. While assessing student papers, the teachers reported that they concentrated equally on grammar, content, and organization. The teachers' main concern is reportedly not on grammar when grading students' papers yet this finding is in apparent conflict with the teachers' responses to question 17, which was about correcting grammatical mistakes when giving feedback.

Table 10

Questions Relating to the Assessment of Papers

Questions	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	χ^2
Q20	1	3	7	12	11	13.647**
	(2.9%)	(8.8%)	(20.6%)	(35.3%)	(32.4%)	
Q21	6	15	8	2	3	15.706**
	(17.6%)	(44.1%)	(23.5%)	(5.9%)	(8.8%)	
Q22	1	10	13	7	3	14.235**
	(2.9%)	(29.4%)	(38.2%)	(20.6%)	(8.8%)	
Q23	1	10	13	7	3	8.647
	(2.9%)	(29.4%)	(38.2%)	(20.6%)	(8.8%)	

Note. Q20- When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on grammar.
Q21- When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on content (the message they are trying to convey).
Q22- When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on organization (e.g, paragraphs, rhetorical structures like argument, persuasive, descriptive).
Q23- When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate equally on grammar, content and organization.
χ^2 = Chi-square
** $p < .01$

The reason for this may be that while giving feedback they want the students to see their grammatical mistakes but while assessing the writings, because there are a substantial number of grammatical mistakes, they do not want the students to become discouraged or to place too much emphasis on grammatical mistakes. The results of the chi-square were significant for questions 20, 21, and 22 at a level of $p< .01$. A non-significant result was found for question 23.

Questionnaire Part B Section II

Research Question: What are the teachers' attitudes towards writing?

In the questionnaire, Part B Section II aimed to investigate teachers' attitudes towards writing. There were eight Likert type questions in this section. For each question, in order to understand teachers' attitudes towards writing, frequencies and percentages and chi-squares were analyzed and the results were interpreted

Table 11 presents the results for Q1, Q2, and Q3 which are about teachers' attitudes towards writing and the teaching of writing. Even though the teachers are not sure whether they like teaching writing or not, their attitudes towards writing in general are more decisively positive. Although the teachers are quite indecisive about teaching writing, the responses in question 2 reveals that nearly two-thirds of teachers like to write. For question 1 the reasons for teachers being undecided about whether they like teaching writing or not may be connected to something revealed in the interviews, namely the teachers' feelings that students are not interested in writing and lack motivation to write. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 1 at a level of $\underline{p} < .01$, which, looking at the distribution of the answers, means that the majority of teachers either agree or are undecided whether they like teaching writing. The teachers seem more strongly positive about writing in general, but non-significant results were found for question 2 due in part to the fact that no one selected the "strongly disagree" option.

Table 11

Questions Relating to Teachers' Attitudes Towards Writing and the Teaching of Writing

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q1	5 (14.7%)	12 (35.3%)	12 (35.3%)	3 (8.8%)	2 (5.9%)	13.941**
Q2	7 (20.6%)	15 (44.1%)	5 (14.7%)	7 (20.6%)	0	6.941
Q3	14 (41.2%)	12 (35.3%)	3 (8.8%)	4 (11.8%)	1 (2.9%)	19.824**

Note. Q1- I like teaching writing.
    Q2- I like to write
    Q3- Teaching writing is more difficult in comparison to listening, speaking, and reading.
    χ^2 := Chi-square
    ** $\underline{p} < .01$

Out of 34 teachers, 26 of them either strongly agreed or agreed that teaching writing is more difficult in comparison to teaching listening, speaking or reading. The reasons for such a result may be that writing in English and writing in Turkish differ from each other quite dramatically. Moreover, the students have very little experience writing even in Turkish. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 3 at a level of $p< .01$, which means that the majority of teachers strongly agree that teaching writing is more difficult when compared with instruction in the other three skills.

Table 12 presents the results for Q4 and Q5, which investigate teachers' attitudes about students' attitudes towards writing. The majority of the respondents (67.7%) agreed with the statement that students are not interested in writing.

Table 12

Questions Relating to Teachers' Ideas About Students' Attitudes Towards Writing

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q4	14 (41.2%)	9 (26.5%)	6 (17.6%)	4 (11.8%)	1 (2.9%)	14.529**
Q5	20 (58.8%)	11 (32.4%)	2 (5.9%)	1 (2.9%)	0	27.882**

Note. Q4- In my opinion, students are not interested in writing.
   Q5- In my opinion, students find it difficult to express themselves in writing.
   χ^2 = Chi-square
   ** $p < .01$

The results of the chi-square were significant for this question at a level of $p< .01$. In the interviews the participants also stated that the students were not interested in writing. For question 5, nearly all teachers, except three, agreed that students found it difficult to express themselves in writing. As the teachers reported in question 4 and in the interviews, students find it very difficult to write and this may be the reason for

their not being interested in writing. The results of the chi-square were significant for

question 5 at a level of p< .01.

Table 13 presents the results for Q11 which asks the teachers whether

instruction is essential in writing or not.

Table 13

Question Relating to Instruction In Writing

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q6	19 (55.9%)	12 (35.3%)	2 (5.9%)	1 (2.9%)	0	26.000**

Note. Q6- Instruction is essential to writing.
χ^2 = Chi-square
** p < .01

Again, all teachers except three, agreed that instruction was essential in

learning how to write. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 3 at

a level of p< .01.

Table 14 presents the results for Q7 which is about teachers being good

writers in order to be able to teach writing. Out of 34 teachers, 14 of them strongly

agreed and five agreed that teachers needed to be good writers themselves in order to

be able to teach writing.

Table 14

Question Relating to Teachers' Ideas of Themselves as Writer

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q7	14 (41.2%)	5 (14.7%)	11 (32.4%)	3 (8.8%)	1 (2.9%)	17.765**

Note. Q7- Teachers' need to be good writers themselves in order to be able to teach writing.
χ^2 = Chi-square
** p < .01

However, 11 teachers stated that they were undecided as to whether teachers needed

to be good writers themselves in order to be able to teach writing or not. The results

of the chi-square were significant for question 7 at a level of p< .01 which mean that the majority of teachers strongly agree that they need to be good writers in order to teach writing.

Table 15 shows the results for Q13 which aims at discovering whether the teachers feel that learning to write requires more time than listening, speaking, and reading.

Table 15

Question Relating to Learning Writing When Compared to Other Skills

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q8	16 (47.1%)	11 (32.4%)	5 (14.7%)	2 (5.9%)	0	13.765**

Note. Q8-Learning to write requires more time than listening, speaking, and reading.
χ^2 = Chi-square
** p < .01

Nearly all teachers, except five who were undecided and two who disagreed, agreed that learning to write required more time than listening, speaking, and reading. It can be assumed that it is difficult to put ideas together when writing in L2, again possibly relating to the students' lack of training in writing even in their L1, and the students therefore need time to write. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 3 at a level of p< .01.

In this section of questionnaires, according to the results, it can be said that teachers' attitudes towards writing are generally positive whereas teachers believe that students' attitudes towards writing are negative. The majority of teachers stated that their students were not interested in writing. The teachers also reported that instruction had an important role in writing, which they generally see as a more difficult skill to acquire than the others.

<u>Questionnaire Part C Section I</u>

Research Question : What are the teacher's attitudes and understandings towards process writing ?

Part C Section I of the questionnaire aimed to investigate teachers' attitudes towards process writing in particular. There were four questions in this section. Question 1 was a yes / no question which asked the teachers if they had ever heard the term process writing. Question 2 asked where they had heard the tem process writing and the participants could choose more than one option. Question 3 aimed to investigate how much teachers knew about process writing and was related to Question 1. Question 4 aimed to investigate teachers' understanding of process writing. Questions 1 and 3 were analyzed quantitatively using frequencies and percentages. Questions 2 and 4 were analyzed qualitatively.

In this section of the questionnaire the number of teachers participating in the questionnaire decreased because the teachers who wrote that they did not know anything about process writing stopped answering the questionnaire. In this section, 21 out of 34 teachers, completed fully and returned the questionnaire. Thirteen teachers reported never having heard the term, and did not, therefore participate in this section of the questionnaire.

Question 2

<u>Where did you hear the term process writing?</u>

The remaining 21 teachers were asked where they had heard the term process writing and were allowed to select more than one option for this question. Eight teachers reported having heard it from a colleague, 11 teachers from a workshop/training program, nine from published materials, seven from a school

where they worked before, and four from other sources, which can be named as the university they graduated from. In general, all the teachers had heard the term "process writing" either from their school environments or as a result of their own individual efforts, such as from attending workshops or keeping abreast of professional developments in their field through published materials.

Table 16 shows the results revealed from question 3 which is about how much the teachers felt they knew about process writing. Out of the 21 teachers who reported having heard the term process writing, only two reported knowing a lot about process writing. Nearly half of them responded that they knew " some" or "a little" about process writing (47.6%), and the remaining nine teachers (42.9%) reported that they knew very little about process writing. Although approximately two thirds of the teachers responded affirmatively to having heard of process writing, question 3 shows that these teachers' self assessment of their familiarity with process writing is in general quite limited.

Table 16

Question Relating to Teachers' Degree of Familiarity With Process Writing

Question	A lot	Some	A little	Very little	Nothing	χ^2
Q3	2 (9.5%)	5 (23.8%)	5 (23.8%)	9 (42.9%)	0	4.714

Note. Q3- How much do you think you know about process writing?
χ^2 = Chi-square

Question Relating to Teachers' Understandings of Process Writing

Question 4 asked the teachers to list specifically all the concepts/ terms/ideas/teaching techniques that they associated with the term process writing. The aim of question 4 was to try and get a picture of the breadth of the teachers' understandings about process writing. The data results reveal that they knew a fair

amount about process writing in the sense that they were able to list several concepts and practices associated with it. Only four teachers out of the 21 did not answer this question, although they had responded "yes" to question 1, indicating that they had heard the term. It can be assumed that due to their limited familiarity, these four teachers do not know specific concepts to associate with process writing.

Among the concepts listed, it is also interesting to note that some are not generally associated with process writing. This shows that some of the teachers have misconceptions/misunderstandings about process writing, and therefore listed concepts which are not considered as elements of process writing. Among these misunderstandings, the teachers listed "making charts", "prompts", "teaching writing step by step"- which is explained as "knowing sentence writing, then paragraph, and an essay". Other listed concepts such as "taking notes", "using background and cultural background of students" could conceivably be a part of process writing but without further elaboration it cannot be known whether teachers are accurately associating these concepts with process writing or not. The existence of some misconceptions seems to go along with their fairly low self assessments of their familiarity with the concept.

The majority of the teachers have some ideas about pre-writing activities of process writing, which they list as "brainstorming", "outlining", and "planning". Many teachers also added "drafting" in their lists. Only two of the teachers list peer feedback, editing or revising . The same two teachers give detailed information about the concepts they list. For example, one of these teachers writes:

> Pre-writing activities (brainstorming, warm up, preparing
> students for the writing task, outlining)
> While writing activities: Students write their ideas, first draft

Post-writing activities: Students check each other's writings and give it back to the students. Students correct their mistakes and hand in the second draft. The process continues until the students write the ideal paragraph or essay. In process writing, there are steps to be followed. It is more time consuming but more effective (T1).

Although only two of the teachers give such detailed information about the concepts, terms, and ideas related to process writing, it should be noted that the question prompt only asked them to list the concepts.

Questionnaire Part C Section II

Research Question : What are the teachers' attitudes and understandings about process writing?

Questionnaire Part C Section II sought to investigate teachers' attitudes about process writing. Part C Section II is made up of 11 Likert-Scale type questions.

Table 17 presents the results for Q1and Q2 which aim at investigating the teachers' ideas about using process writing both in their own classroom and the institution. Of the 21 teachers answering this part of the questionnaire, nine teachers stated that they did not know whether they should use process writing in their institution but 12 were in overall agreement that it would be a good idea. Question 1 shows that while many teachers are not sure about using process writing in their institution, none of them expressed open disagreement to the prospect. Recalling their responses to an earlier question, most of the teachers reported knowing only "a little" about process writing. The teachers' unfamiliarity with process writing may be affecting their indecisiveness over whether they should use it or not. Some of the teachers know process writing as a term only but have not practised it before. This too is likely making them undecided about whether to use it or not in the institution.

In fact, the results are quite positive, since no one disagreed outright with the idea of using process writing in their institution.

Table 17

Questions Relating to the Practice of Process Writing

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	don't know	disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q1	5 (23.8%)	7 (33.3%)	9 (42.9%)	0	0	1.143
Q2	6 (28.6%)	10 (47.6%)	4 (19.0%)	1 (4.8%)	0	8.143*

Note. Q1- We should use process writing in our department.
    Q2- I would like to teach writing using a process model of writing.
    χ^2 = Chi-square
    * p < .05

Contrary to question 1, in question 2 teachers were more decisive in their positive responses about personally wanting to use a process writing approach to teach writing. Sixteen teachers (76.2%) either agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to teach writing using a process model of writing. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 2 at a level of p< .05.

The reason for the teachers' personal desire to use process writing in their own classes might be that the teachers want to learn about process writing first and apply it in their classes while they are being trained. After applying it in their classes and seeing the possible outcomes of process writing, the teachers would feel more comfortable about recommending its usage officially in the institution.

Table 18 presents the results for Q3, Q5, Q7, Q8, and Q9 which all relate to advantages of process writing. The majority of the respondents agreed that process writing was effective for students' writing and that it would contribute to the students' writing. The teachers seem to believe that the students may find it easier to express themselves if they are taught writing via a process writing approach.

Table 18

Questions Relating to the Advantages of Process Writing

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q3	4 (19.0%)	11 (52.4%)	4 (19.0%)	2 (9.5%)	0	8.905*
Q5	10 (47.6%)	9 (42.9%)	2 (9.5%)	0	0	5.429
Q7	7 (33.3%)	11 (52.4%)	3 (14.3%)	0	0	4.571*
Q8	4 (19.0%)	12 (57.1%)	4 (19.0%)	1 (4.8%)	0	12.714**
Q9	4 (19.0%)	10 (47.6%)	6 (28.6%)	1 (4.8%)	0	8.143*

Note. Q3- Process writing would help our students to be better writers.
   Q5- Process writing helps students to have better developed and better organized essays.
   Q7- Process writing helps students to form more coherent paragraphs
   Q8- Process writing would have a positive impact on teacher-student relations.
   Q9- Process writing would have a positive impact on student-student relations.
   χ^2 = Chi-square
   * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The results of these questions were similar to the results of the research done

by Zamel (1985) and Pennington (1995) which revealed that students expressed

themselves better by using this approach. In the interviews, the interviewees also

reported that they thought process writing would be useful for their students, that it

would increase the collaboration between the teachers and students, and that, in

general, it would contribute to writing lessons in their institution. The results of the

chi-square were significant for question 8 at a level of $p < .01$ which means that a

significant number of teachers felt that process writing would have a positive impact

on the teacher-student relationship. The results of the chi-square were significant for

questions 3, 7, and 9 at a level of $p < .05$.

Table 19 presents the results for Q 4, Q6, Q10, and Q11 which are about the

disadvantages of process writing. A small majority of the respondents (52.4%)

disagreed or strongly disagreed that process writing was time consuming.

Table 19

<u>Questions Relating to the Disadvantages of Process Writing</u>

Questions	Strongly agree	Agree	don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree	χ^2
Q4	3 (14.3%)	2 (9.5%)	5 (23.8%)	8 (38.1%)	3 (14.3%)	5.429
Q6	3 (14.3%)	9 (42.9%)	6 (28.6%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (9.5%)	10.190*
Q10	2 (9.5%)	4 (19.0%)	8 (38.1%)	6 (28.6%)	1 (4.8%)	7.810
Q11	5 (23.8%)	4 (19.0%)	4 (19.0%)	5 (23.8%)	3 (14.3%)	.667

<u>Note.</u> Q4- Process writing is time consuming.
   Q6- My students are not proficient enough to give valid feedback on their peers' works.
   Q10-Process writing is not appropriate for L2 learners who still have big problems with
       grammar.
   Q11- Process writing brings extra workload on teachers.
   χ^2 = Chi-square
   * <u>p</u> < .05

Of course, the wide disparity in the results to Q4 need to be interpreted in light of the fact that most of the teachers have never actually used process writing in their classes and cannot know whether process writing is indeed time consuming or not. Interestingly, in the interviews, all the teachers approached the disadvantages of process writing in terms of time, all mentioning that it took time. Presumably, considering their own students' proficiency levels while answering questions 6 and 10, the majority of the respondents reported that they did not know whether their students could give valid feedback on their peers' works or whether process writing is appropriate for L2 learners who have big problems with grammar. The reason for this unsure response is again logically that the majority of the respondents have not practised using process writing. The results of the chi-square were significant for question 6 at a level of <u>p</u>< .05. Non-significant results, however were found for question 10 and the results given to question 11 are also very evenly distributed. Again, we can assume that the teachers are not sure whether process writing brings

an extra workload on teachers or not because of not having applied it in their own writing classes yet.

Summary

Forty six questions were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Twenty one out of 34 teachers reported having heard the term process writing. In terms of writing instruction practices, the questionnaire responses show that nearly two-thirds of the teachers use at least some steps of process writing (e.g; pre-writing activities) in their classes but they may not know that these steps are associated with the process writing approach.

Twenty one teachers who responded that they have heard the term process writing seem to have some misconceptions and misunderstandings of what process writing is.The information about teachers' having misconceptions/misunderstandings is gathered from Q4 which asked them to list the concepts term / ideas/ related with process writing. The teachers' know very little or some about process writing which show their familiarity with it.

Although the teachers have not for the most part practised teaching writing consciously using a process writing approach, they seem to believe in its overall effectiveness and its usefulness for helping students to write more organized and coherent paragraphs. The teachers also report believing that process writing may increase the collaboration between students and teachers.

Interviews

The interview questions (See Appendix B) were prepared according to the items of the questionnaire in order to obtain more detailed information and to get respondents to express their ideas in their own words. The interview consisted of 17

questions. The questions involved the teaching practices of teachers at Muğla University, the general writing situation at Muğla University, and the understandings and attitudes of the teachers towards process writing.

Questions 1, 2, 9, 11, 12,13,14, and 15 investigated the interviewees' teaching practices of writing. Questions 2, 3, 4,5, 10, 16, and 17 investigated the interviewees' understandings and attitudes towards process writing. Questions 6 and 9 investigated the general writing situation at Muğla University.

Seven teachers were interviewed. The interviewees were selected purposefully according to the results of the questionnaire. According to their responses, two teachers who knew about process writing and had positive views about it, two teachers who knew about process writing but seemed to have misconceptions or misunderstandings about process writing, and two teachers who claimed not to know anything about process writing were selected. The administrator of the school was also interviewed in order to find out his views and understanding of process writing.

The interviews were analyzed qualitatively. The responses of the interviewees were categorised under six headings. These four headings were chosen according to the research questions which are given as follows:

Research Questions:

1. What are the teachers' attitudes and understandings about process writing?

2. What are the teachers' reported writing instruction practices?

3. What are the teachers' attitudes towards writing?

For the sake of clarity, the teachers who were interviewed, were given codes in the presentation. These codes are A1 and A2 (for the two teachers who knew

about process writing and had positive views), B1 and B2 (for the two teachers who reported knowing about process writing but seemed to have misunderstandings /misconceptions about it), and C1and C2 (for the two teachers who did not know about process writing). D is used to refer to the school administrator.

The categories can be listed under the following headings;

- Teachers' understandings of different elements of process writing

- Teachers' perceptions of process writing

  a. Advantages of process writing

  b. Difficulties/disadvantages of process writing

  c. Teacher -student interaction

- Teachers' teaching practices of writing

- Training

- Contribution of process writing to the program

- Teachers' attitudes towards writing

Analysis of Interviews

Teachers' Understanding of Different Elements of Process Writing

Unsurprisingly, five of the interviewees (A1, A2, B1, B2, and D) did indeed have some understandings about what process writing is. In the questionnaire, these four teachers had rated their own degree of familiarity with the concept as "some" or "very little". This very general idea about process writing comes through in the interviews.

When asked to explain what process writing is, A1 responded:

> Writing is not an end in itself. It is an ongoing process. You can not say that "today this is our topic. Let's write it". It is wrong. You have to prepare the students to the writing task.

Or as another teacher reported:

> This kind of writing begins with brainstorming. Step by step,
> getting general knowledge about topic, drafting, elaborating on
> their mistakes, correcting their mistakes, giving feedback. (A2)

As it is seen from the comments of these teachers, they consider process writing not only as a finished product but as a process, moving back and forth between the teacher and the students. They also focus on the "process" of teacher involvement in student writing, in the sense of thoroughly preparing them, and giving them feedback.

The teachers were able to express themselves clearly when they were asked about pre-writing activities and drafting.

In the words of participant A1:

> By pre-writing activities I mean giving time to get ideas for
> the writing topic, organizing their ideas, brainstorming,
> forming an outline, and having them write their first drafts.

In the words of participant B2:

> Before students start to write, they talk about the writing
> topic, read about the topic and have some information about
> the topic, ask question to each other, outline and plan what
> they are going to write.

Or as another participant stated:

> Before I ask the students to write, I ask them to think about
> the writing topic and make an outline about what they are
> going to put in their paragraphs. I ask them to think about the
> introduction, development, and conclusion, make a plan and
> write it down. I also have them do brainstorming by
> speaking, giving guidelines, and using the suggestions in the
> book (B1).

In other words, the teachers in different words are expressing the same concepts associated with pre-writing activities. The teachers are saying that they have

their students generate ideas, brainstorm, outline, and plan before getting them

to start writing.

Most of the teachers are also aware of the element of drafting in process

writing, though they may not actually practice it in class. In the words of

participant A2:

> I try to ask the students to rewrite, but not very often because
> of the time constraint.

Or as another participant stated:

> I do not have them write drafts now. But when I was teaching
> Double Take, I had them write drafts. They wrote drafts, let
> their partners edit their drafts, hand in their drafts, and I
> corrected their drafts corrected by their peers. The students
> wrote it for the second time by developing it. I had them write
> two drafts (B1).

The teachers also indicated the importance of peer feedback and, editing.

They especially pointed out the importance of these concepts when they were

asked the reason for using them. In the words of participant D:

> I believe in effectiveness of peer feedback because students
> learn from each other.

Or as participant C2 stated:

> The students are interested in their friends' mistakes. They
> want to learn new ideas. They will get used to it. If we do not
> correct their papers and give enough feedback, they will not
> be interested in writing.

The teachers agree that peer feedback and editing are important for the

students in terms of learning from each other and gaining confidence. The students,

by seeing their mistakes, become aware of the points missing in their words, and they

try to correct them. While doing this, their writings become better.

Two teachers (C1 and C2) had reported in the questionnaire not having heard the term process writing. During the interview, it was revealed that C2 had in fact used the elements of process writing in the past with her students at Anatolian High Schools but simply did not know that this kind of writing was called "process writing". However, C1 stated that she had never heard or used a process writing approach in her writing classes.

Teachers' Perceptions of Process Writing

Advantages of Process Writing

All the teachers believed that both themselves and the students could benefit from process writing. They explained that for the students they would learn how to express themselves by going through certain stages. In the words of participant A2:

> The students could benefit from process writing. It is really important to get ready and do the writing through certain organization. We could achieve it by using process writing and also it would be a kind of development for the students.

In the words of participant A1:

> It is useful for the students. The students may get bored because of dealing with the same topic over and over but they understand that it is useful for them. They also themselves see that their writings are improving at each stage.

In the words of participant D:

> Yes, we could benefit from it. Process writing gives students awareness of structures and sense of writing. Process writing improves writing skill. Students can overcome fears and doubts about writing. They can understand how to write and see it as an easy skill.

In the words of participant B2:

> The students learn how to express themselves and how to write.

As understood from the teachers' comments, the teachers believe that the students will benefit from process writing, which confirms the findings of Diaz (1985) and Hildebrand (1985). Both of those researchers stated that the process-oriented class gave students confidence and awareness about the writing process. As Zamel (1987) pointed out in process writing classes, the students feel as though they are writers and they are encouraged to take risks and create meaning with the teachers giving suggestions and advice.

<u>Difficulties / Disadvantages of Process Writing</u>

Mainly, the difficulties / disadvantages of process writing are approached from the students' perspective more than teachers'. Only two teachers approached it from teachers' perspective. Several teachers referred to problems of student boredom. They stated that students might get bored while going through all the stages. As participant A1 stated:

> The students write at least two drafts. If I ask them write more than two drafts they can get bored. They may say that I have already written about this topic. I will correct it one day but do I have to give it back?

Or as another teacher reported:

> The students think that why they would have to write the same things twice and why they would not do more useful things instead of dealing with the same topic over and over again (D).

As participant B2 stated:

> If the students are not interested in the topic and do not have any information about the topic, it is difficult to have them write. It takes a long time and it can be boring.

Another student-related possible disadvantage reported by the teachers is the lack of motivation in students. The teachers stated that the students were not willing

to write and added that it was difficult for the teachers to motivate and prepare

students to write. As participant B2 stated:

> It is difficult to motivate students. Students' knowledge about
> the topic is important. If they do not know anything about the
> topic, it is difficult to write.

In the words of participant D:

> Students are not eager to write. They would like to do it
> outside the class.

Or as another teacher reported:

> Most students do not volunteer to write. They see it as a
> burden. Following a step by step procedure is a burden for
> them (A2).

In the words of participant B1:

> There are demotivated students and you can not make them
> ready.

From the above comments, it can be seen that the teachers first need to make

their students aware of the importance of the various stages in writing. It can be

assumed that if the students learn the reasons for what they are doing in their writing

class, they will be more eager to write, and they will have learned how to express

themselves better.

Two teachers did, however, talk about disadvantages of process writing from

the teachers' perspective. The first of these went back to the issue of boredom, but

this time from the teachers' point of view:

> Usually the teachers get bored dealing with the same topics
> over and over again as students do. It brings extra work load on
> teachers because the number of the papers they check increase
> (C2).

The second on the other hand, touched on the amount of preparation required of the

teachers:

It needs a lot of preparation for the teacher. The teachers should prepare their lesson plans in detail. They should prepare what they are going to do in pre-writing activities, while-writing and post-writing activities (A1).

The latter reflects a general concern held by the several of the teachers, about problems of time. The teachers stated that because they have to follow a curriculum that is tightly scheduled, it would be difficult for them to use process writing appropriately and incorporate all of its elements.

As one participant stated:

Time is a problem. We have to follow up a syllabus and sometimes we have problems about falling behind the curriculum. Process writing needs a lot of preparation both by the students and teachers (B1).

In the words of another participant:

Although I want to have the students to write the second drafts, I can not because of time constraint (A2).

These findings again show a similarity with the literature reviewed. In the literature, it has been stated that because process writing requires input both from the teacher and the student, it has been considered as time consuming.

Teacher- Student Interaction

Four of the interviewees (A1, B1, B2, and D) stated that they believed that process writing increases the interaction between the teacher and the students.

As participant A1 stated:

It increases the cooperation between the teachers and students and also between the students. While they are writing, you should monitor the class and be ready when they need help. You should not sit at your at desk and watch them write.

As participant B2 stated:

In process writing you are always interacting with the students. You speak about the topic, ask questions about the

> topic, students answer and they write. Then you give feedback
> about their writings, correct their mistakes and return it back
> to the students.

As mentioned above, and by participant D in the section about difficulties /disadvantages, a possible misunderstanding about process writing seems to emerge although this was not reported openly during the interviews. It is implied by some of the teachers that process writing is solely focused on in-class writing. The teachers report monitoring and providing help to the students, not just sitting at their desk, and watching them write. It can be assumed that some of the teachers may consider time as an important disadvantage because they think that all the steps of process writing are done in class.

Practices

In the interviews, the teachers were also asked about their own teaching practices of writing, in particular those which included the elements of process writing (brainstorming, outlining, drafting, peer feedback, and editing).

One teacher (C1) could not answer the questions about teaching practices. In the words of participant C1:

> I do not do any of these activities (brainstorming, outlining,
> drafting, peer feedback, and editing) in my classes. I assign
> writing topics as homework out of class.

Participant C2 also reported not doing any of these activities now, but was still able to comment on practices because she had used them in the past:

> I used such teaching practices of writing (brainstorming,
> outlining, drafting, peer feedback, and editing) at Anatolian
> High Schools where I had previously worked but I do not use
> them now because of time constraint and tightly scheduled
> curriculum.

Five of the teachers interviewed use brainstorming in their writing classes as a pre-writing activity. They all believed in the effectiveness of brainstorming. They

stated that by brainstorming, students generated ideas and these ideas formed the first

step of the students' writing process. The teachers' responses to brainstorming also

confirmed the results of question 15 on the questionnaire which was about

encouraging students to brainstorm about the writing topic before starting to write.

Brainstorming is one of the activities which is done by nearly all the teachers.

In the words of participant A2:

> Without brainstorming, it is difficult for the students to write.
> They are at a loss about what to write.

As participant A1 stated:

> I want students to brainstorm in groups or in pairs. For
> example, the topic is education. I write the topic on the board.
> I ask the students what they can write about the topic. First
> they write their ideas in their notebooks. I write them on the
> board. We choose the most appropriate ideas to the topic. The
> students jot down their ideas.

Or as another teacher reported:

> I always have them do brainstorming by speaking about the
> topic, giving guidelines, and using suggestions in the text
> book (B1).

For outlining, drafting, peer feedback, and editing the teachers stated that

they did not do these activities very often. Although they do not have their students

give peer feedback very often, they believe in its effectiveness.

In the words of one teacher:

> When the peers give feedback, the students feel that it is more
> sincere. The teacher always shows their mistakes but peers
> easily understand their feelings of being corrected. It can be
> sometimes harmful because the students may not take it
> serious (B1).

Or as another participant stated:

> When the students give feedback to each other, I want them
> not to write their names on the paper because they will feel
> more confident. They do not feel restricted. Students can learn

from each other's mistakes. Sometimes while editing each
other's mistakes, they can make mistakes. After they edit, I
take back and check if their editing is correct or not (A1).

For drafting, the teachers mentioned the time constraints and boredom of students. The teachers also stated that although they sometimes asked the students to hand in second drafts with the necessary changes and corrections made, the students rarely did so. In the words of participant A2:

I try to have the students write drafts but I could not do it very
often because of time constraint.

Or as another participant stated:

The students write the first draft then I check their first draft.
They also check their peers' writings. After getting feedback
both from the teacher and the peer, the students correct it and
give me for the second time. I check it again. The students
write two drafts. If I ask them to write more than two drafts
they get bored (A1).

As participant B2 stated:

Drafting is something we always do. What the students give
me as a product is a draft. I am not asking the students to do it
but students are writing drafts in some way.

When she was asked to elaborate further what she meant by her statement above, it was revealed that in fact, what this participant labelled as "drafts" referred only to the written assignment handed in by the students. These so-called "drafts" however, are never edited either by the students or teachers and are never re-written. This clearly reveals a misunderstanding of the concept of drafts.

Training

All the teachers agreed that what they needed was in-service training. They all stated that first they should learn more clearly about what process writing is, and then they would be able to apply it in their classrooms. Even if they could not make

it an official part of the curriculum they agreed that it would be useful to pilot it in

some classes and see whether it worked or not.

As one participant stated:

> The teachers need a lot of in-service training about process
> writing. First they should learn what process writing is and
> then they can apply it in their classrooms. Here we do not
> have much in-service training (A1).

The other participants reported that they needed theoretical information about

process writing. This might be provided with the help of workshops/seminars/

training programs/ reference books (A2, B1,B2, C1, C2,& D).

Contribution of Process Writing to the Program

In terms of teachers' beliefs about how process writing would contribute to

the program, the teachers generally agreed that process writing would contribute

positively to writing lessons in the school. However, only two teachers (A1 and B2)

responded in-depth to this question, and, interestingly, the responses of these two

teachers were in opposition to each other. In the words of participant A1:

> Because Muğla University School of Foreign Languages is a
> preparatory school and we are dealing with four skills, it
> would be difficult to use in the institution. Another problem
> we should take into consideration is also time constraint.
> Students are all elementary level and adapting process writing
> to elementary level might be a little difficult.

As participant B2 stated:

> Writing should be done by process writing beginning from
> elementary level. As teachers, we should lead the students
> and teach them how to express themselves beginning from
> sentence level in elementary level.

In the literature reviewed, Rodrigues (1985) touched upon the issue of

students' proficiency level. His findings partially confirm the words of

participant A1, and contradict those of participant B2. He was saying that what

process writing underestimates is that students are not professional writers.

Before the students start to write, they need to learn the structures and model to

practice. The students need proper instruction and encouragement for writing. In

order to adapt process writing as Rodrigues (1985) mentions, the students'

needs should be taken into consideration.

Teachers' Attitudes Towards Writing

Teachers' attitudes towards writing can be grouped under three sub-headings:

the teachers' own feelings towards writing, their problems with teaching writing, and

their thoughts on how students think about writing.

In terms of the teachers' own feelings towards writing, in general the

teachers are positive about writing. On the questionnaire, their responses to questions

1 and 2 in Part B Section II revealed that the attitudes of teachers towards writing

were positive. Nevertheless, the teachers complained about not having enough time

to devote to writing and do extra writing activities in class and these can be assumed

as their problems with teaching writing. In the words of participant B1:

> I do all the writing activities in the book but I have no time to
> do extra writing activities in the class.

Or as participant C1 stated:

> I do not devote some time to writing. I assign it as a
> homework.

Another important factor which seemed to affect the teachers' attitudes'

towards writing is their perceptions of students' attitudes towards writing. The

teachers complained that if the students are not motivated and willing to write, they

become demotivated, too. In the words of one teacher:

> Students do not like writing because writing process is the
> most difficult skill. They have to use all their knowledge of

English. I want to teach writing but if they are not motivated,
I become demotivated, too (B2).

Or as another participant reported:

Students are not eager to write. They would like to do it out of
the class (D).

In the words of participant C2:

Most students think that writing is difficult. They do not want
to write but when I ask them, they do not object. Unwillingly,
they write.

Lack of motivation on the part of the students and their reluctance to write affect teachers' own attitudes towards writing and change their positive attitudes towards writing to negative ones. It is worthwhile to recall that in order to motivate the students and increase their interest in writing, the teachers play a very important role. For example, in Tyson's (1999) study, one of the students reported that he would not read his essay when his professor returned it with a grade only and no comment on it. However, when his professor started to give feedback, he began to express himself better and his attitude towards writing turned positive.

Conclusion

According to the responses from the interviews and the questionnaire, the teachers' understandings of process writing are predominantly limited to pre-writing activities. Both the teacher responses on the questionnaire and the interviews showed that in contrast with other concepts related with process writing, the teachers used pre-writing activities such as outlining, brainstorming in their writing classes. In terms of teachers' understandings and attitudes towards process writing, the interviews clarified certain concepts, terms, and ideas which had seemed vague on the questionnaire. For example, although one teacher answered "no" to the question

about whether she had ever heard the term process writing or not, the interviews revealed that she had used it in her classes before but did not know the name. All seven teachers who were interviewed and most of the teachers on the questionnaire stated that their students were not interested in writing and that students could not express themselves in writing.

In general both in the interviews and on the questionnaire, teachers stated that they were in favour of process writing and would like to teach writing by using the process writing approach. Moreover, they reported believing that their students would benefit from process writing.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study investigated the attitudes and understandings of teachers towards process writing in the school of Foreign Languages at Muğla University. It also investigated teachers' reported writing instruction practises and teachers' attitudes towards writing.

The reason for investigating this subject was the idea of searching for alternatives to Muğla University's current approaches to writing lessons, which the teachers have frequently complained about. The teachers have also often complained about their students' not being able to express themselves in writing and about the writing lessons not being very productive. As the first step in deciding whether to implement all or elements of a process writing approach, this project aimed at investigating what the teachers knew and understood about process writing. According to the research results, the implementation process might take place.

A second reason for investigating this topic was to contribute to the literature on process writing as there is a gap in the literature looking at perceptions of teachers towards process writing. Many studies have looked at process writing in terms of its implementation, the composing processes of students using process writing, and student attitudes towards process writing. However, fewer studies have looked at it in terms of teachers' perceptions' of it, particularly in an EFL context.

First, examples from the literature about what process writing is, the difference between process writing and product writing, teachers' attitudes towards and understanding of process writing, advantages and disadvantages of process writing, and empirical research done on process writing were given.

As the attitudes of teachers in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla university were investigated, the teachers in this department were the only subjects of the study. Thirty four teachers completed the questionnaire and six teachers and the administrator of the school were then interviewed. Descriptive analysis, frequencies and percentages and chi-square values were used to present the data from the questionnaire. For the questions with more than one option on the questionnaire, categorization was used. The answers were grouped according to the most common points.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted after the analysis of the questionnaire. To analyze the answers given in the interviews, categorization was used. The answers were grouped according to the research questions. After grouping the responses of the participants, the researcher interpreted the answers of the participants in the interviews.

Results and Discussions

In this chapter the results of the data are discussed by answering each of the research questions. The first research question was, what are the attitudes and understandings of teachers who work in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University towards process writing?

Teachers' Attitudes About Process Writing

In general, the teachers are in favour of process writing. According to the 21 teachers who reported having heard about process writing, the majority of them believe in the effectiveness of process writing in improving students' writing although most have never explicitly practised it in their classes. The teachers believe that their students could start writing better if a process writing approach were

implemented, and that process writing may increase the collaboration between the students and the teacher. These findings support those of studies conducted by Diaz (1985) and Hildebrand (1985). According to the research results of those two teacher researchers, process writing increased collaboration among the students and the teacher, and the students began to write meaningfully in addition to gaining confidence and awareness about their writings.

The number of participant teachers who reported having practised process writing was very few (only two), and even though many teachers had heard the term process writing, they reported knowing very little about it. These two factors may explain in part why, on the questionnaire, teachers report being willing to apply a process writing approach in their classes, but were nevertheless undecided about the application and implementation of a process writing approach at the institutional level. These findings seem to suggest that teachers want to use process writing first on an individual basis before being prepared to decide if process writing would contribute to their institution or not.

Another reason for the teachers' being more decisive about using process writing in their classes rather than in the institution may be due to cultural reasons. By implementing first on individual basis, the teachers may want to see if process writing is appropriate to their context and their students. In Clachar's (2000) study, the findings revealed that a process approach was inappropriate for Turkish students who are taught to think and write in a different way. Two teachers in the current study had, however, used process writing in the institutions where they had previously worked, and they stated that although students were tired of writing drafts, they benefited overall from process writing.

The teachers report that they want to teach writing by process writing but they have some concerns such as time and a tightly scheduled curriculum, which were the problems also raised in Caudery's (1995) study. Because of having limited time for writing, both in terms of lessons per week and overall course length, the teachers may need to adapt all or parts of a process writing approach to their own contexts. The similarity between Caudery's findings and the findings of the current study are somewhat surprising because the contexts of the two studies differ from each other. Caudery (1995) conducted the study in an ESL context, whereas this study was conducted in an EFL context. Although the contexts are different, the teachers complain about similar concepts. In any case, it is important to note that the process writing approach was originally developed in and for the L1 classroom. Since process writing approach was developed for L1 classrooms, it may need to be adapted according to the needs of students in L2 classrooms. As Caudery (1995) notes, "relatively little seems to have been done to develop a process approach which is specifically oriented towards L2 writing", and suggests that "the time for this may be ripe" (p.11).

Another similarity between Caudery's study and the findings of the current study is that the teachers already seem to be adopting some elements of the process writing approach some of the time rather than using it in its entirety. The teachers in Caudery's study emphasized making students more aware of the benefits of writing process and of why they are writing, which is an idea shared by some teacher participants in the interviews in the current study.

One negative attitude which some teachers seemed to associate with process writing was the possibility of a lack of motivation and of boredom on the part of the

students. The majority of the teachers raised, in particular, the issue of writing multiple drafts, and added that students got bored while writing for the second time about the same topic. Moreover, the teachers themselves did not want to deal with the same topic over and over again. Even the teachers who have not used process writing talked about multiple drafts and possible student boredom. It is possible to extrapolate from other data given that the reason why they are feeling in this way might be that because they feel that their students are not interested in writing and that it is difficult motivating them to write. They may fear that having students write multiple drafts may make them even further lose their interest in writing.

Teachers' Understandings About Process Writing

Twenty one teachers who reported having heard the term process writing, listed certain concepts, terms, and ideas associated with process writing on the questionnaire. These data revealed that the teachers' understandings of process writing can be grouped under three headings as "complete understandings", "limited understandings", and "misunderstandings" of process writing. The reasons for gathering more in-depth information about teachers' understandings of process writing were that even if the teachers claim that they know about process writing, it is important to discover how much they know and therefore what kind of training they might need to have, since most of the teachers have not actually practised it.

Complete Understandings of Teachers About Process Writing

Two teachers, because of having practised a process writing approach before, gave detailed, well-informed information about process writing both on the questionnaire and in the interviews. These teachers mentioned pre-writing activities such as brainstorming, outlining, and planning as well as other process writing

concepts such as drafting, editing, teacher and peer feedback, revising, and evaluation. They were able to clearly express not only what these concepts were but also the rationale behind using them. Moreover, they were both able to draw a complete picture of a process writing model, rather than only isolated aspects of one by exemplifying it.

Limited Understandings of Teachers About Process Writing

The majority of the teachers had more limited understandings of process writing. For example, many seemed to have ideas about various pre-writing activities of process writing, which were listed as brainstorming, outlining, and planning. Some teachers also added drafting to their lists. According to the teachers' self reports, the activities listed above are used by the majority of teachers while teaching writing. The remaining 13 teachers reported not knowing what process writing is, but nevertheless may be unconsciously using various elements of process writing in their teaching. The reasons for the teachers' having limited understandings of process writing may be that the teachers are coming from different backgrounds. Some of the teachers are graduates of departments of English Language and Literature. The teachers also do not have in-service training in the school so they are forced to catch up with innovations in the field of English language teaching solely through their own efforts. Another reason might be that because writing is not taught as a separate skill, the teachers are not able to devote enough time to writing, and therefore teaching writing is limited to the writing tasks in the book. The reason for using pre-writing activities might be that the teachers might think that students simply cannot write without being introduced to the topic because there are not explicit pre-writing

activities in the textbooks and this "introduction" is best accomplished by pre-writing activities such as brainstorming, outlining, and planning.

<u>Misunderstandings of Teachers About Process Writing</u>

Among the 21 teachers who reported having heard of process writing, there were some teachers who seemed to have actual misunderstandings or misconceptions about process writing. Among these misunderstandings, the teachers listed "making charts", "prompts", "teaching writing step by step"- which is explained as "knowing sentence writing, then paragraph, and an essay". To this list can perhaps be added "taking notes" and "using background and cultural background of students". These could conceivably be a part of process writing but without further elaboration it cannot be known whether the teachers' understandings of these truly matched with process writing or not. The existence of some misconceptions seem to go along with the teachers' fairly low self assessments of their familiarity with the concepts. The reasons for these apparent misunderstandings might be that the teachers do not know much about process writing, but were trying to predict what process writing is.

According to the responses of some teachers in the interviews, another misunderstanding of teachers might be that process writing is thought to consist purely of in-class activities. Some teachers stated that they could not use every single element of process writing because of time constraints which may stem from a belief that every step must take place in the class.

Identifying the degree of teachers' understandings of process writing is important because the teachers will play an important role if there is to be a future implementation of process writing in the curriculum. It is the teachers who know the ongoing program and the students in that program, because the teachers are at the

heart of the teaching process. Moreover, in order to have a successful

implementation of process writing in the curriculum for the future, it is also

important to find out and clarify the misconceptions or misunderstandings of teachers

about the process writing approach.

Training

All the teachers agreed that what they needed was in-service training. They

all stated that first they should learn more clearly about what process writing is, and

then they would be able to apply it in their classrooms. Even if they could not make

it an official part of the curriculum, they agreed that it would be useful to pilot it in

some classes and see whether or not it worked. For instance, in the studies conducted

by Mol (1991), Pennington (1995), and Tyson (1999), the teachers either did not

know much about or were negative about process writing, but after being exposed to

a process writing approach through workshops, training programs, and seminars, the

teachers' attitudes towards process writing changed. In this case, the teachers'

attitudes towards process writing are already quite positive, which is an advantage. It

could be hoped, therefore, that with the help of the training program,

misunderstandings about process writing might be clarified, the teachers' knowledge

and understanding of a process writing approach might be expanded, and the training

program would be even more successful because of their already positive attitudes.

Level of Appropriateness

All the teachers think that they should adapt the process writing approach to

their own situations. In the interviews a couple of teachers stated that they should

start using it beginning from the elementary level onwards. Only one teacher

specified a reason for using a process writing approach at the elementary level,

stating that they should start using a process writing approach beginning from the sentence level onwards so they would be better able to help their students express themselves in writing. On the other hand, one of the teachers who reported having used a process writing approach before, stated that it would be difficult to adapt the process writing approach at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages because of its being a preparatory school. She added that process writing was more useful and effective for more advanced level English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses because her experience had been one of using it in these classes. In order to adapt a process writing approach, the students' needs should be taken into consideration. The reason this teacher suggests using process writing in ESP or EAP classes might be linked to the proficiency level of students, which is an issue also raised by Rodrigues (1985). He pointed out that process writing needs to be adapted according to the needs of the students.

For the implementation of process writing at the elementary level, the situation at Muğla University should also be considered. The reason for the teacher's suggestion of using it at the elementary level might be that all of the students are at an elementary proficiency level and most of the students are not skilled writers even in Turkish. Although they have been exposed to an intensive English language education program, they still are unable to express themselves in English and this is apparent in their exam papers. Therefore, it might be better if the students begin to be taught how to write in an organized manner from the outset. A process writing approach may provide a framework for such instruction.

The second research question was, what are the teachers' writing instruction practices?

The results for this question were quite evenly distributed but the most common points the teachers share is that even though the teachers stated that they did not know or that they knew very little about process writing, they generally seem to be using some elements of process writing in their classes. Most do some form of pre-writing activities before they have the students write about the topic. They have their students generate ideas about the writing task and provide input about the writing topic before the students start to write, by having the students brainstorm and make outlines about the topic. As writing is not taught as a separate skill at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages, sometimes the teachers do not have time to do all the writing activities in the text books or to bring extra materials into the class. Although the teachers stated that their main concern was not grammatical structures in writing, grammar still seems to be of their primary concern in terms of their actual teaching practice as shown by question 17 on the questionnaire.

Unconsciously, the teachers seem to be using some elements of process writing while teaching writing. They do not simply leave their students on their own to write. The teachers in some way prepare the students for the writing process, but the process they use for preparing students to start writing is not carried further. In other words, they do not have their students write multiple drafts, give peer feedback or edit.

The third research question was, what are the teachers' attitudes towards writing?

The teachers all have quite positive attitudes about writing but generally seem to find teaching writing difficult when compared to speaking, listening, and reading. The teachers all complain that their students are not interested in writing and it is difficult for them to motivate the students to write. The reason given for the lack of motivation in students towards writing is that students are not able to express themselves in writing. Another reason for the lack of motivation for students to write might be because of the context of Muğla University which is not an English medium university. As explained in the statement of the problem (See Chapter 1, p. 5) the majority of students are not required to study English so they might think that writing is the least important skill for them when compared to other skills.

The teachers are quite positive about writing and consider writing as one of the most important skills despite the students' disinterest, the time constraints, and the tightly scheduled curriculum. They seem largely to be in favour of the future implementation of a process writing approach because they see process writing as possibly providing the cure they have been searching for-both a cure for themselves to teach writing and for the students.

<center>Recommendations</center>

Since the teachers are generally in favour of using process writing and believe in the effectiveness of process writing, it seems that it would be a positive decision to try implementing a process writing approach. First, however, as pointed out by several of the teachers, they need to be trained. The first thing to be done should be to plan sessions for training. Teachers stated that they needed in-service

training about process writing. They want to have theoretical information about process writing, and then to be given training sessions on the pedagogical implementation of this approach. The training should be done by someone who is knowledgeable about process writing and/or preferably by people who have been using process writing. Hands-on workshops should be included in these training sessions. If the administration plans to implement process writing, teacher training should begin as soon as possible because it is not a very easy process. It might take some time to train the teachers about process writing because the teachers first need to learn themselves how to write by using process writing. As stated by Mol (1991), the University of British Columbia Department of Language Education conducted writing workshops in order to train the teachers in writing and help them to experience the various stages of writing process themselves. In Pennington's (1995) study, the training of the eight secondary school teachers continued for six months, and while being trained the teachers also used process writing in their classes. Among the various techniques that may be used in the training sessions, teachers may be asked to write by using process writing or they may be asked to teach a sample lesson by process writing.

While trying to implement process writing, the teaching situation at Muğla University and the needs of the students should be considered first. Muğla University is not an English medium university, but in some departments students are required to study English for a year. Therefore, English courses in the School of Foreign Languages are compulsory for these students. The needs of these students and the needs of the other students who attend the program on a voluntary basis vary from each other. By taking into consideration the needs of the students and situation,

necessary changes and an adaptation of process writing should be planned. These adaptations may be done according to the students' content areas so that the students' needs in terms of writing may also be met in the best way.

While trying to implement process writing and train teachers about what process writing is, what needs to be made aware of is that process writing is also an evolving concept. Throwing out all aspects of product writing will not likely be the solution to the problems of writing at Muğla University, nor will the blind acceptance of a basic process writing model without consideration of how it may be adapted to best meet the needs of teachers and students at Muğla University. The teachers should also be made aware of the other writing pedagogies emerging in the field of writing such as the questions raised by the proponents of post-process writing, and during the training, the teachers should consider which approach or combination thereof best meets their needs and students' needs.

Another issue is piloting. Before process writing is implemented on a wide-scale, it should be piloted in some classes to see whether it is working or not with these classes and students. Students' attitudes should be investigated, especially towards drafting, as the teachers in the interviews stated that the students might get bored with writing drafts. According to the piloting and attitudes of the students, the teachers may think about whether to use process writing or not. Piloting should continue for at least one whole term in order to have reliable results about the effectiveness of process writing on students' writing, and to investigate students' attitudes towards process writing. Anything less than one term would not allow students or teachers to view a full picture of a process writing approach, and to observe the potential benefits that various studies have found occurred over time.

Throughout the interviews, the main concern expressed by the teachers was that of time constraints. All the teachers, during the interviews, reported not having enough time to do the writing activities in order to follow the curriculum even as it currently stands. For an implementation of process writing or aspects of it, curricular changes would ideally need to be made. These curricular changes should be planned in terms of increasing the amount of time devoted to English classes so that the teachers should be given enough space to deal with writing more.

Limitations of The Study

The first thing to say about limitations of this study is that this study is not generalizable. The study was conducted in the School of Foreign Languages at Mugla University with 34 teachers, so the results of the study can only be said to show that those teachers are in favour of process writing. It would not be accurate to say at this point that all or most teachers in Turkey have the same attitudes towards process writing. Only 21 teachers in the study reported knowing about process writing as opposed to 13 teachers who had never heard the term process writing. Again it cannot be said on the basis of this study that this reflects the general level of familiarity with process writing among all EFL teachers in Turkey. This study only investigated teachers' attitudes towards process writing. There was no classroom observation on how the teachers taught writing.

Another limitation that this study has is in terms of inter-coder reliability. The interviews were analysed by using categorization and these categories were determined by the researcher. As the categories were not checked by someone who is knowledgeable in the field, they may lack reliability.

Implications for Further Research

This study investigated the attitudes and understanding of teachers who work in the school of Foreign Languages at Muğla University towards process writing. Future studies can be conducted to see the attitudes and understandings of teachers working at other state universities towards process writing, perhaps in the form of a wide-scale survey.

Another thing that could be investigated would be to conduct follow-up studies at Muğla University, School of Foreign Languages as the process writing approach is experimented with them. This could include finding out whether there are any positive effects of process writing on students' writing capabilities. The writings of students instructed by process writing and product writing may be compared and contrasted with each other in order to see which approach is more effective on their writing capabilities. The students' perceptions of whether process or product writing is more useful for them can also be investigated.

After the teachers have been trained about process writing, process writing can be piloted on a voluntary basis in order to investigate if the teachers' attitudes towards process writing change or not, or to see how much their familiarity with process writing increased with the help of the training sessions.

The attitudes of those teachers who reported not having heard the term process writing can also be searched after the training sessions, in order to have an overall picture of the teachers, working at Muğla University, towards process writing. These teachers can be interviewed in order to have more in-depth information about their developing attitudes towards process writing.

Classroom practises of teachers about how they are teaching writing can also be investigated via observations in order to check the data revealed from the questionnaire.

Conclusion

According to the data results, it might be concluded that the majority of teachers working in the School of Foreign Languages at Muğla University have quite positive attitudes towards process writing. Some teachers' understandings about process writing is limited and some have misunderstandings, but these misunderstandings might be clarified and the limited understandings might be expanded with the help of a training program. In the interviews, all the teachers seem open to the idea of receiving training about process writing and they seem to be in favour of its implementation in the institution.

Trying to choose the most appropriate writing pedagogy for the benefit of students is not an easy job, because in the ELT world new techniques and methods to writing constantly emerge. It is not a black and white situation. While trying to choose or implement the new methods, the students needs should certainly be taken into consideration, as should the expert opinion of the teachers. The teachers know the students and the context in which the teaching is taking place. As the teachers are the heart of the teaching process, they are the people who can be considered to know best for their students, for themselves and also for the institution. Before the implementation of any new program or approach, in order to get the maximum benefit, the teachers should be trained first and then they should consider which points to adopt or adapt to their contexts.

References

Adams, A. (1995). Teachers of writing must write first, pp. 1-8. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384900)

Applebee, A. N. (1986). Problems in process approaches: Toward a reconceptualization of process instruction. In A. R. Petrosky, & D. Bartholomae (Eds.), *The teaching of writing* (pp. 95-113). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Baines, L., Baines, C., Stanley, G.K., & Kunkel, A.(1999). Losing the product in the process. *English Journal, 88,* 67-72. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ585439)

Bizzel, P. (1986). What is "composing"?. In A. R. Petrosky, & D. Bartholomae (Eds.), *The teaching of writing* (pp. 49-70). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Caudery, T. (1995). What the "process approach" means to practising teachers of second language writing skills. *TESL-EJ, 1.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 579733)

Clachar, A. (2000). Opposition and accommodation: An examination of Turkish teachers' attitudes towards western approaches to teaching writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 35,*151-167.

Dyer, B. (1996). L1 and L2 composition theories: Hillock's environmental modé and task-based language teaching. *ELT Journal, 50,* 312-317.

Edge, J. (1996). Cross-cultural paradoxes in profession of values. *TESOL Quarterly, 30,* 9-30.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication, 28,* 122-130.

Measuring Teacher Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming (1985). Retrieved January 10, 2002, from, http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC-Digests/ed 289885.htm

Ferris, D., & Hedgecock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practise.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 23,* 27-45.

Freeman, D. (1992). Language teacher education, emerging discourse, and change in classroom practise. In J. Flowerdew, M. Brock, & S. Hsia (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 1-21). Hong Kong: Department of English, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Gage, J. T. (1986). Why write ? In A. R. Petrosky, & D. Bartholomae (Eds.), *The teaching of writing* (pp.8-29). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Goldstein, A. A., & Carr, G. P. (1996). Can students benefit from process writing? *NAEPfacts, 1*, 1-7. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 395320)

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1986). No new lamps for old yet, please. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 789-795.

Horowitz, D.M.(1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 445-460.

Jarvis, D. J. (2002). The process writing method. *The Internet TESL Journal, 8,* 1-4.

Kameen, P. (1986). Coming of age in college composition. In A. R. Petrosky, & D. Bartholomae (Eds.), *The teaching of writing* (pp. 170-187). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Kent, T. (1999). *Post-process theory: Beyond the writing process paradigm.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Liebman-Kleine, J. (1986). Two commentaries on D. M. Horowitz's process, not product: Less than meets the eye. In defence of teaching process in ESL composition. *TESOL Quarterly,* 20, 782-789.

Matsuda, P. K. (in press). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 12.

Mol, A. M. (1991). *A comparative case study of implementation of writing as a process*. Published Dissertations / Theses, University of British Columbia, Canada. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352655)

Mondor, S. (2001, December). Why it's so hard to get post process. Retrieved July, 2 2002, from http://www.humboldt.edu/~slm37.

Myers, S. (1997). Teaching writing as a process and teaching sentence level syntax: Reformulations in ESL composition feedback. *TESL-EJ,* 2, 1-13.

Olson, G. A. (1999). Toward a post-process composition: Abandoning the rhetoric assertion. In T. Kent (Ed.), *Post –process theory : Beyond the writing* (pp.7-16). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. New York: Printer publishers Ltd.

Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 17-56.*Pennington, M.C. (1995). The teacher change cycle. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 705-731.

Pennington, M. C., Brock, M. N., & Yue, F. (1996). Explaining Hong Kong students' response to process writing: An exploration of causes and outcomes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5,* 227-252.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-258.*

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 407-430.

Reid, J. (2001). Writing. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 28-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risinger, C. F. (1987). Improving writing skills through social studies. *Eric Digest, 40.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED285829)

Rodrigues, J. R. (1985). Moving away from writing process worship. *English Journal, 74,* 24-27.

Susser, B.(1994). Process approaches in ESL /EFL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 31-47.

Tyson, E.R. (1999). Using process writing effectively in Korean University EFL classes. Paper presented at the 12th World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA '99) at Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan, August 1-6, 1999.

White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing.* Edinburgh Gate: Longman Group Limited.

Williams, J. D. (1998). *Preparing to teach writing: Research, theory, and practice.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

You, X. (2002). Justifying ESL writings place in post-process theory. Retrieved July 2, 2002, from http://icdweb.cc.purdue.edu/~youx/Res…

Zamel, V.(1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 10,* 67-75.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16,* 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17,* 167-187.

Zamel, V.(1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 697-715.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Dear Colleagues,

I am a student in the MA TEFL 2002 Program at Bilkent University. I am conducting a study on teachers' attitudes and understandings about the process model of writing. There may be changes made in the writing curriculum at Muğla University and these may involve process writing. Therefore it is important to learn what you do or do not know about process writing, what opinions you may or you may not have about it, so that its introduction can be smooth and its implementation effective. This will be of benefit to you as teachers, to the administration, and ultimately, to the students. My aim is to learn how much you know about process writing and your general attitudes about process writing. Please answer the questionnaire fully and honestly. Your answers will provide valuable data and will be useful and helpful not only for my thesis but also for you / our program. Your answers will be kept entirely confidential. The researcher is the only one who will see the individual answers. It is important however that you do write your name as the second part of the research will include interviews with certain teachers selected according to the diversity of answers given on their questionnaires.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Özlem Gümüş

A-Background Information

Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes and provide necessary information

below.

1. Name: ....

2. Surname: ………………

3. Age:

   ❐ Below 25   ❐ 25-30   ❐ 31-35   ❐ 41-45   ❐ above 45

4. Total years teaching experience

   ❐ less than 1 year   ❐ 1-5   ❐ 6-10   ❐ 11-15   ❐ 16-20   ❐ above 20

5. Qualifications in teaching:

   ❐   B.A/B.S

   ❐   M.A

   ❐   Ph. D

   ❐   Diploma Programs (please specify): …………

6. Other schools where you have taught. You may choose more than one option.

   ❐   Public/State school

   ❐   Private College

   ❐   University

   ❐   Private courses

7. How long have you been teaching in your present institution?

   ❐   Less than 1 year   ❐ 1-5 years   ❐ 6-10 years   ❐   10-15 years

Part B

I. Questions About Teaching Practices

Please tick **(✓) only one option** for each item..Try to check what you *actually*

do, not what you think maybe you *should* do.

Always: 5   Often: 4   Sometimes: 3   Rarely: 2   Never: 1

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	I do all the writing activities in the text book.					
2.	For writing tasks, I bring into class extra materials (e.g., from the Internet, other books).					
3.	For writing tasks, I bring into class authentic materials (e.g., newspapers, magazines).					
4.	I present a writing model to the classroom before students start to write.					
5.	I help students by giving suggestions and advice about how to organize their ideas.					
6.	I provide input to generate ideas about the topic (e.g. write about your most memorable summer holiday) and type of the writing (e.g., narrative) before the students start to write.					
7.	I have students work in groups of two or more for prewriting Tasks (e.g., brainstorming, outlining).					
8.	I have students work in pairs or groups to prepare a single written text.					
9.	I have students get ideas from each other before starting to write.					
10.	Before students start writing, I have my students spend time researching about the writing topic.					
11.	Before they start writing, I have my students spend time thinking about the writing topic.					
12.	I encourage students to concentrate on content rather than on grammatical structures, spelling and punctuation when they					

	write.					
13.	Before doing any actual writing, I have my students develop an outline.					
14.	I have my students write more than one draft of their work.					
15.	I encourage my students to brainstorm about the writing topic before doing any actual writing.					
16.	Before doing any actual writing, I have my students plan what they are going to write					
17.	When I give feedback on students' writing, I try to correct all their grammatical errors.					
18.	I have my students make written comments on each other's drafts.					
19.	I have my students correct each other's punctuation, spelling, and grammar mistakes.					
20.	When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on grammar.					
21.	When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on content (the message they are trying to convey).					
22.	When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate mainly on organization (e.g, paragraphs, rhetorical structures like argument, persuasive, descriptive).					
23.	When I *grade* students' papers, I concentrate equally on grammar, content and organization.					

II. Attitudes of Teachers About Writing

  Please tick **(✓) only one option** for each item.

  Strongly agree: 5   Agree: 4   Undecided: 3   Disagree: 2   Strongly disagree:1

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	I like teaching writing.					
2.	I like to write.					
3.	Teaching writing is more difficult in comparison to listening, speaking, and reading.					
4.	In my opinion, students are not interested in writing.					
5.	In my opinion, students find it difficult to express themselves in writing.					
6.	Instruction is essential to writing.					
7.	Teachers' need to be good writers themselves in order to be able to teach writing.					
8.	Learning to write requires more time than listening, speaking, and reading.					

Part C- Attitudes of Teachers Towards Process writing

    I- Please answer the following questions. Tick (✔) the box.

    1- Have you ever heard the term '*process writing' ?*

            ❒   No   ❒ Yes

If No, you may stop here

2- If yes , where did you hear it? You may choose more than one option.

       ❒   from a colleague

       ❒   from a workshop / training program

       ❒   from a published materials

       ❒   from a school where I worked before

       ❒   other (please specify) _____

 3- How much do you think you know about process writing?

      ❒   A lot   ❒ Some   ❒ A little   ❒ Very little   ❒ Nothing

4- Please list specifically all the concepts/terms/ideas/teaching techniques that you associate with the term process writing.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. Please tick **(✔) only one option** for each item.

Strongly agree: 5   Agree: 4   Don't know: 3   Disagree: 2   Strongly disagree:1

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	We should use process writing in our department.					
2.	I would like to teach writing using a process model of writing.					
3.	Process writing would help our students to be better writers.					
4.	Process writing is time consuming.					
5.	Process writing helps students to have better-developed and better-organized essays.					
6.	My students are not proficient enough to give valid feedback on their peers' works.					
7.	Process writing helps students to form more coherent paragraphs.					
8.	Process writing would have a positive impact on teacher-student relations.					
9.	Process writing would have a positive impact on student-student relations.					
10.	Process writing is not appropriate for L2 learners who still have big problems with grammar.					
11.	Process writing brings extra workload on teachers.					

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions

1. How much time do you devote to writing per class in a week?

2. What is your students' attitude towards writing in general? Do you think that students' positive or negative attitude towards writing affect your attitude towards writing? What is their reaction to the written assignment they get back from you?

2. What do you know about process writing ? (Could you tell me if you ever heard the term process writing?

3. Do you believe that you and your students could benefit from process writing? If yes how? If no, why ?

4. What kind of difficulties do you think you may face while teaching writing with process approach?

5. What do you think about having separate writing lessons as opposed to integrated skills courses?

6. What do you think the potential weaknesses and strengths of process writing are? (depending on how clearly # 4, # 5 are answered)

7. To you, what is the difference between a product-oriented writing and process writing?

8. In order to implement process writing, what kind of training would you like to have?

9. Do you believe that process writing has any effect on the interaction between teachers and students or not? If yes, how? If no, why?

10. Do you ever have your students write drafts? Why or why not? If so how exactly you do it? How many drafts do you have your students write?

11. Do you have your students make " outline"? Why or why not? If so how exactly you do it?

12. Do you have your students "brainstorm" before they start to write? Why or why not? If so how exactly you do it?

13. Do you believe in the effectiveness of peer feedback in writing as well as with teacher feedback? Please explain your reasons? Have you ever asked your students to comment on each others' writings? Do you think it is generally helpful?

14. Do you have your students edit each other's punctuation, spelling and grammar mistakes? If yes, how? If no, why not? Do you teach them the mechanics of writing such as punctuation, spelling, and capitalization?

15. Do you think process writing would be an effective contribution to writing lessons in our institution? If yes, how? If no, why or why not?

16. Do you believe that students would improve their writing by using process writing or not? If yes, how? If no, why not?